

MAY 3 1950

Volume LXV

MAY, 1950

Number 5

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

dark

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF N. CAROLINA

## CONTENTS

WILKINS, E. H.—Letters Addressed to Petrarch,	293
WILKINS, E. H.—The Miscellaneous Letters of Petrarch,	297
STRUVE, GLEB.—Marginalia Pushkiniana,	300
SCHEIDER, ELISABETH.—Two Metaphysical Images in Hopkins's "The Wreck of the Deutschland,"	308
DUNBAR, VIOLA E.—The Revision of 'Daisy Miller,'	311
HAVENS, E. D.—Henry James' "The Impressions of a Cousin,"	317
FRIEDMAN, A. R.—Jean de Nivelle an Englishman?	319
RICE, WETHEROP H.—The Birth-Date of Michael Taillevent,	325
WILEY, W. L.—Stateline's Interest in Languages and Literature,	331
BAIT, R. F.—Flaubert, Physician of Chateaubriand,	336
NEISS, R. J.—A Letter from Stéphane Mallarmé,	339
HAMRA, A. R.—What Happened to Maupassant's Play, "La Demande?"	341
CHAMBERS, FRANK M.—More About the Word "Assassin" in Provencal,	343
TAYLOR, ARCHER.—"Or Est Versus Qui Amors" and the English Proverbial Phrase "To Take His Master,"	344
TAYLOR, A. P.—The Sick Time,	345
HARVEY, EDWARD.—Edward Estlin in the "Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature,"	347

## REVIEWS:—

E. R. CURTIUS, Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter. [Ernst Auerbach.]	348
E. H. DAVIDSON, Hawthorne's Last Phase. [E. H. Pease.]	351
C. F. HARROLD (ed.), The Works of JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, Vols. IV-VIII. [W. H. Houghton.]	354
CHARLES Tennyson, Alfred Tennyson. [F. H. Voil Motter.]	356
H. A. MURRAY (ed.), Pierre. By HERMAN MELVILLE. [Richard Chase.]	358
C. H. BISHOP, Prepositions in French and English. [H. F. Miller.]	359
EDITH G. KIRK, The Influence of Helimius and Vossius upon French Dramatic Theory. [Vernon Hall, Jr.]	360
AGrippa d'AUQUIER, Le Printemps: L'Hécatombe à Diane. 3d. édit. de M. B. GAGNERIN. [L. J. Benoit.]	361
BERNHARD BLUME, Thomas Mann und Goethe. [H. C. Hatfield.]	363
WILLIAM WITTE, Schiller. [F. W. Kaufmann.]	364
W. VON DEN STEINEN, Notker der Dichter und seine geistige Welt. [J. M. Scherf.]	365

BRIEF MENTION: W. A. REEDMAN (ed.), GERHARD HAUPTHANK, Die Finsternisse. Requiem; LEONARD FORSTER (ed.), CONRAD CLOUTIER; JOHN OBB (ed.), JUAN RENAU, La Lei de l'Ombre,	366
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18, MD.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with Interruption from July to October (inclusive).

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER  
KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Fein, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. D. Havens, E. Malakis, R. B. Reniston,  
Pedro Salinas, Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00  
for the United States and Mexico and \$6.50 for other countries  
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MF*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RR*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

## Announcing

### FRENCH TRAGEDY IN THE TIME OF LOUIS XV AND VOLTAIRE, 1715-1774

By H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

A sequel to the author's nine volume *History of French Dramatic Literature in the 17th Century*, and *Sunset, A History of Parisian Drama in the Last Years of Louis XIV, 1701-1715*, this study seeks to show how the work of Corneille and Racine was carried on or modified by their successors, Voltaire, La Motte, Piron, de Belloy, Lemierre, etc.

Reviewing the influence of Shakespeare and other English dramatists,

the internal causes leading to the substitution of romantic for classic tragedy, the extent to which Voltaire and others employed tragedy as a vehicle for political and religious propaganda, the author also discusses the actors and actresses of the *Comédie Française*, their theatre, their methods, their finances, and such striking figures as Michel Baron, Adrienne Le Couvreur, Dumesnil, Chalon and Le Kain.

IN TWO VOLUMES — \$10.00

*The Johns Hopkins Press*



Baltimore 18, Maryland

Entered as Second-Class Mailer at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LXV

MAY, 1950

Number 5

---

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO PETRARCH

There is here attempted, for the first time, a complete listing of the extant published letters addressed to Petrarch. The order of arrangement follows the alphabetical order of the first names of the several writers. Arabic numerals preceding the initial words of the several letters correspond to the order of the letters in this list; roman numerals correspond to numerals used for these same letters in the editions concerned. Professor Giuseppe Billanovich of the Warburg Institute and Professor R. Weiss of the University of London have helped me very greatly in the making of this list.

### Andrea Dandolo.

Two letters from Dandolo, two from Benintendi dei Ravagnani, and three from Guglielmo da Pastrengo are included in the collection entitled "Epistole .lvii . eiusdem poete: et aliorum" contained in the collective edition of the works of Petrarch published in Venice in 1501. This collection was reprinted in the collective editions of 1503, 1554, and 1581.

1. II. *Promissam diuque optatam.*
2. IV. *Amice dum singulare.*

### Antonio Roverio: see Niccolò II d'Este.

### Barbato da Sulmona.

Two letters are published by M. Vattasso in his *Del Petrarca e di alcuni suoi amici*, Rome, 1904, pp. 12-15 and 32-33, and a third by Weiss, in his "Some New Correspondence of Petrarch and Barbato da Sulmona," in *Modern Language Review*, XLIII (1948), 63.

3. *In die nativitatis.*
4. *In maximis lacrimarum.*
5. *Frater carissime.*

## Benintendi dei Ravagnani.

See above, under Andrea Dandolo.

6. XIII. *Nerius noster.*
7. XVI. *Si plus debito.*

## Cecco di Meletto Rossi.

One letter is to be published in a posthumous article by A. F. Massèra (which is being prepared for publication by A. Campana).

8. *Redargui posset.*

## Charles IV.

Three letters from Charles IV and eight from Johann von Neumarkt are published by P. Piur in his *Petrarcas Briefwechsel mit deutschen Zeitgenossen* (= K. Burdach, *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation*, Vol. VII), Berlin, 1933.

9. II. *Laureata tua* (written by Cola di Rienzo).
10. XXVIII. *Affectu magno.*
11. Anhang VIII. *Etsi ab imperatorio* (diploma for Petrarch as Count Palatine).

## Clement VI.

Three letters are published by C. Cipolla, the first in his "Francesco Petrarca canonico di Pisa nel 1342," in R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, *Atti*, XLI (1905-1906), 175-180, and the second and third in his "Note petrarchesche desunte dall' archivio vaticano," in the *Memorie* of the same Academy, Ser. II, LIX (1909), Scienze morali storiche e filologiche, pp. 28-32.

12. *Licterarum scientia, vita ac morum.*
13. *Litterarum sciencia ac morum* (a papal bull).
14. *Literarum sciencia tuorumque.*

## Cola di Rienzo.

Two letters are published by Burdach and Piur in their *Briefwechsel des Cola di Rienzo* (= *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation*, Vol. II), Part V, Berlin 1912, pp. 85-86 and 406-410.

15. XXV. *Dulcissima literarum.*
- 9: see Charles IV.

## Coluccio Salutati.

Five letters are published by F. Novati in his edition of the *Epistolario* of Coluccio, Vol. I, Rome, 1891. All are in Book II of the *Epistolario*.

16. IV. *Facundissime vir, diu herentem.*

17. VIII. *Facundissime vir, preter expectatum.*
18. XI. *Multa maximique.*
19. XV. *Vir egregie, quem.*
20. XVI. *Semper, vir egregie.*

Florence.

A letter from the "Prior artium et vexillifer justitie populi et communis Florentie" (written by Boccaccio) is published by J. F. P. A. de Sade in his *Mémoires pour la vie de François Pétrarque*, Vol. III, Amsterdam, 1767, as No. XXIX among the "Pièces justificatives" at the end of the volume. Reprinted by F. Corazzini in his edition of the *Lettore edite e inedite* of Boccaccio, Florence, 1877, pp. 391-394. To be republished by Billanovich in his forthcoming *Scuola del Petrarca*.

21. *Movit jam diu.*

Francesco da Fiano.

One letter is published by Weiss in his *Il primo secolo dell' umanesimo*, Rome, 1949, pp. 147-149.

22. *Pavor ingens.*

Francesco Nelli.

Thirty letters are published by H. Cochin in his *Un ami de Pétrarque: lettres de Francesco Nelli à Pétrarque*, Paris, 1892, and in an Italian edition, *Un amico di Francesco Petrarca: le lettere del Nelli al Petrarca*, Florence, 1901. Since these letters are so numerous, so familiar, and so easily accessible, it seems unnecessary to list them individually here.

23-52.

Giovanni Boccaccio.

Four letters are published by A. F. Massèra in his edition of the *Opere latine minori* of Boccaccio, Bari, 1928.

53. II. *Mavortis miles.*
54. IX. *Ut huio epistolae.*
55. X. *Oppinaris.*
56. XIV. *Ut te viderem.*

21: see Florence.

Giovanni Dondi.

One letter is published in *Francisci Petrarchae epistola quae inter editas est prima XII. libri senilium*, Padua, 1808, pp. 35-49. Republished by V. Bellemo, in his *Jacopo e Giovanni de' Dondi*, Chioggia, 1894, pp. 295-310.

57. *Debui, nec ignoro.*

## Giovanni Fei.

One letter from Fei and one from an unknown writer are published by A. Antonielli and F. Novati in their "Un frammento di zibaldone cancelleresco lombardo del primissimo Quattrocento," in *Archivio storico lombardo*, Ser. IV, XL (1913), 245-314. The letter from Fei is republished by Weiss in *Il primo secolo dell' umanesimo*, pp. 144-146.

58. II. *Optavi diu.*

## Guglielmo da Pastrengo.

See above, under Andrea Dandolo. The second and third letters are reprinted by A. Avena, in his "Guglielmo da Pastrengo e gli inizi dell' umanesimo in Verona," in *Accademia d'Agricoltura Scienze Lettere Arti e Commercio di Verona, Atti e memorie*, Ser. IV, VII (1907), 287-289. (The roman numerals just below are those of the edition of 1501.)

- 59. XXXIV. *Heus care.*
- 60. XXXVI. *Haud equidem.*
- 61. XXXVII. *Tenes memorie.*

## Johann von Neumarkt.

See above under Charles IV.

- 62. IV. *Vtinam Parnasei.*
- 63. VII. *Aureis redimita.*
- 64. X. *Saphirei fundamenti.*
- 65. XII. *De fecundo pecore.*
- 66. XV. *Presuasiva dulcedo.*
- 67. XXI. *Stili magistralis.*
- 68. XXIX. *Sicut Astaroth.*
- 69. XXXII. *Rogo vos.*

## Lombardo della Seta.

One letter is published by G. Fracassetti (who attributes it to Petrarch) as No. 3 in his *Appendix litterarum* in his edition of Petrarch's *Epistola de rebus familiaribus et variae*, Florence, Vol. III, 1863, pp. 506-513. This one letter and a few quotations from a second are published by Giuseppina Ferrante in her "Lombardo della Seta umanista padovano (1390-1430)," in *R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Atti*, XCIII (1933-1934), Part II, 480-487 and 481-484.

- 70. *Fervet animus.*
- 71. *Amissimus heu.*

## Niccolò Acciaiuoli.

One letter is published by Cochin, *op. cit.*, on pp. 309-310 of the French edition and p. 112 of the Italian edition, and a second by Vattasso, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-22.

- 72. *Postquam superne.*
- 73. *Convenientibus nobis.*

Niccolò II d'Este.

One letter (written by Antonio Roverio) is published by G. C. Amaduzzi in his *Anecdota litteraria ex mss. codicibus eruta*, Vol. II, Rome, 1773, pp. 298-299.

74. *Anzia mens.*

Paolo de Bernardo.

Two letters are published by T. Casini in his "Notizie e documenti per la storia della poesia italiana nei secoli XIII e XIV," in *Il Propugnatore*, N. S., I (1888, Part II), 348-351. Republished by L. Lazzarini in his *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell' umanesimo in Venezia* (= *Biblioteca dell' Archivum romanicum*, XIII), Geneva, 1930, pp. 168-170. (The roman numerals just below are Lazzarini's).

75. *II. Amantissime pater.*

76. *III. Arguit modo.*

Roberto di Battifolle.

One letter is published in part and a second completely by L. Mehus in his *Ambrosii Traversarii generalis Camaldulensium aliorumque ad ipsum et ad alios de eodem Ambrosio latinae epistolae*, Florence, 1759, pp. cxxvi and cxxxxix. Both are to be republished by Billanovich in his forthcoming *Scuola del Petrarca*.

77. *O felix quem.*

78. *Indignationem tuam.*

Unknown writer.

See above, under Giovanni Fei.

79. *XXVIII. Hominem elegantem.*

ERNEST H. WILKINS

*Harvard University*

---

#### THE MISCELLANEOUS LETTERS OF PETRARCH

In addition to the 500-odd letters included by Petrarch in his three collections—the *Familiares*, the *Seniles*, and the *Sine nomine*—there are extant some eighty letters of his which he did not so include. Fifteen such letters appear among those printed in the 1501 collective edition of the works of Petrarch (and reprinted in the three later 16th-century collective editions) under the heading "Epistole . lvii . eiusdem poete: et aliorum."<sup>1</sup> In 1863 Fracassetti

<sup>1</sup> Of the other 42 letters, 26 are *Familiares* and 16 are *aliorum*.

combined these fifteen letters and 50 others, gathered indefatigably from a great variety of sources, in a collection which he called the *Epistolae variae*.<sup>2</sup>

There remained, however, still other scattered Petrarchan letters. An attempt to gather some of them was made by Fracassetti, who appended to his edition of the *Variae* a group of eight letters, which he called *Appendix litterarum*.<sup>3</sup> Of these eight letters, however, No. 3 is by Lombardo della Seta; Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 8 are *Sine nomine* 4, 7, 3, and 2; and No. 6 is an early form of *Ep. fam. VIII* 2-5. This leaves only two of the eight letters, Nos. 5 and 7, as being really uncollected letters of Petrarch.

An attempt to list the scattered, or miscellaneous, letters not included in Fracassetti's *Appendix litterarum* was made in my *Modern Discussions of the Dates of Petrarch's Prose Letters*.<sup>4</sup> This list included six letters, the first of which, however, has been shown not to be a letter by Petrarch, while No. 5 is properly to be regarded as *Ep. sen. XIII* 5.

There is here offered a new list of the miscellaneous letters of Petrarch—that is, of the surviving letters of Petrarch that are not included either in any one of his own collections or in Fracassetti's edition of the *Variae*. The list includes Nos. 5 and 7 from Fracassetti's *Appendix litterarum*, Nos. 2-4 and 6 from my previous list, and twelve additional letters.<sup>5</sup> The several letters are listed in the order of their first publication.

1. *Quatuor inuestiuarum*. To Boccaccio. Sent with a copy of the *Invectivarum contra medicum quendam libri IV*. Printed as an *Epistolarius Praefatio* to that work in the 1496 collective edition of the works of Petrarch, f. aa2r. Reprinted in the four 16th-century collective editions.

2. *Leonardo mio*. To Leonardo Beccanugi. In Nicolo Franco, *Il Petrarchista*, Venice, 1539, ff. 40v-41r. Reprinted often in the 16th

<sup>2</sup> *Francisci Petrarcae Epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae*, ed. by G. Fracassetti, Florence, 1859-1863, Vol. III, pp. 309-488. Of the 65 *variae*, Nos. 1 and 23 are not by Petrarch; Nos. 9 and 31 are early forms of *Ep. sen. XIII* 11 and 10 respectively; No. 53 is an early form of *Ep. fam. VIII* 10; and No. 65 is the original ending of *Ep. sen. V* 2.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. III, pp. 489-536.

<sup>4</sup> Chicago, 1929, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Several of these additional letters have been brought to my attention by Professor Giuseppe Billanovich of the Warburg Institute and Professor R. Weiss of the University of London, who are helping me in the preparation of a revised edition of the *Modern Discussions*.

century; also in Fracassetti, *Lettere di Francesco Petrarca delle cose familiari . . . volgarizzate . . .*, Vol. I, Florence, 1863, pp. 7-8. To be republished by Billanovich in his forthcoming *Scuola del Petrarca*. This is the only extant letter written by Petrarch in Italian.

3. *Malicia salutabis Ganum*. To Malizia (a *giullare*). No. 5 in Fracassetti's *Appendix litterarum*.

4. *Orationis celeberrimae*. To Giovanni Mori. No. 7 in Fracassetti's *Appendix litterarum*.

5. *Nunquam opes* (fragment). To an unknown addressee. This fragment and the next are quoted by Barbato da Sulmona in his *Expositio Epistole "Jam tandem"* (Petrarch's *Ep. fam. XII 2*), published in part by N. F. Faraglia in his "Barbato di Sulmona e gli uomini di lettere della corte di Roberto di Angiò," in *Archivio storico italiano*, Ser. V, III (1889). Both fragments appear on p. 354.

6. *Saluto Barbatum* (fragment). To Barbato da Sulmona. In Faraglia, *loc. cit.*

7. *Tuorum fama consiliorum*. To Iacopo Bussolari. Written in the name of Bernabò Visconti. In F. Novati, "Il Petrarca e i Visconti," in *F. Petrarca e la Lombardia*, Milan, 1904, pp. 59-61.

8. *Sera equidem*. To Giovannolo da Mandello. In Novati, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-63. Republished by P. Piur in his *Petrarcas Briefwechsel mit deutschen Zeitgenossen* (= K. Burdach, *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation*, Vol. VII), Berlin, 1933, pp. 250-251.

9. *Multa se offerunt*. To Barbato. In M. Vattasso, *Del Petrarca e di alcuni suoi amici*, Rome, 1904, p. 17.

10. *Ego autem* (fragment). To Boccaccio. Quoted by Boccaccio in his letter *Suscepi, dilectissime*, to Barbato. In Vattasso, *op. cit.*, p. 27. Republished by A. F. Massèra in his edition of the *Opere latine minori* of Boccaccio, Bari, 1928, p. 145.

11. *Barbate optime*. To Barbato. In Vattasso, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

12. *Quo sepius*. To Johann von Neumarkt. In P. Piur, "Ein unbekannter Brief Petrarcas an Johann von Neumarkt," in *Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte*, 1931, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, pp. 49-52. Republished by Piur in his *Petrarcas Briefwechsel*, pp. 87-91.

13. *Plebanus sancti Iuliani*. To Francesco Bruni. This and the next two letters are published in an Italian translation by V. Rossi in his "Nell'intimità spirituale del Petrarca," in *Nuova antologia*, Ser. VII, CCLXXVIII (1931), 3-12. The Latin texts have not yet been published.

14. *Ante non multos dies*. To Bruni. *Ibid.*

15. *Dubium ne an viveres*. To Bruni. *Ibid.*

16. *Inter varias*. To Barbato. In Weiss, "Some New Correspondence of Petrarch and Barbato da Sulmona," in *Modern Language Review*, XLIII (1948), 63-66.

17. *Magnifice frater.* To Aldobrandino III d'Este. Written in the name of Bernabò Visconti. In Weiss, *Il primo secolo dell' umanesimo*, Rome, 1949, pp. 136-137.

18. *Quam cara.* To Roberto di Battifolle. Published in an Italian translation by C. Beni in his "Ricordi del Petrarca nel Casentino," in Società Colombaria di Firenze, *Atti*, 1932, pp. 300-303. The Latin text is to be published by Billanovich in his *Scuola del Petrarca*.

The foregoing list disregards the *Epistola posteritati*, which is properly to be regarded as *Ep. sen. XVIII* 1, and the *Contra cuiusdam galli calumnias*, which is in epistolary form. It disregards also such letters as are certainly apocryphal.

ERNEST H. WILKINS

*Harvard University*

---

#### MARGINALIA PUSCHKINIANA

##### *Pushkin's "only intelligent Atheist"*

In March, 1824, Pushkin, who was then living in semi-exile in Odessa, where he was employed in the office of the Governor-General, Count Michael S. Woronzow (Vorontsov), wrote a letter to one of his friends, probably Prince Peter Viazemsky, which was intercepted by the Moscow police and of which only the following fragment has been preserved:

Reading Shakespeare and the Bible I have sometimes the liking for the Holy Ghost, but I prefer Goethe and Shakespeare. You want to know what I am doing. Writing motley stanzas of a romantic poem and taking lessons of pure Atheism. There is here an Englishman, a deaf philosopher, the only intelligent Atheist I have so far met. He has written some 1000 pages to prove *qu'il ne peut exister d'être intelligent Crâteur et régulateur*, doing away in passing with the feeble proofs of the immortality of soul. Not as comforting a system as is usually thought but unfortunately the most likely one. . . .

This letter was, if not the main reason, at least one of the principal excuses for Pushkin's transfer, in the summer of 1824, to another place of exile—his mother's estate of Mikhailovskoye in north-western Russia. The question of the identity of Pushkin's "deaf philosopher" and "intelligent Atheist" naturally attracted

the attention of Russian students of Pushkin. His first biographer, Paul Annenkov, was the first to identify him in 1874 as "Dr. Hunchison," whom, he said, Pushkin used to meet in Woronzow's house and who was a great admirer of Shelley. Another well-known student of Pushkin, Morozov, suggested that the name must have been Hutchinson. The subsequently published correspondence between Woronzow and his friend Longinov confirmed Morozov's surmise and established the fact that Dr. Hutchinson was Woronzow's family physician. On October 21, 1821, Woronzow wrote to Longinov from Paris:

There is living with us a certain Dr. Hutchinson who was strongly recommended to us in London; he will accompany us to Russia; an excellent man, scholarly and well-bred, he has had enough practice already and, what is of particular advantage to us, has been attached to the Children's Hospital in London where in eighteen months he treated up to 2,000 children. He has one small drawback, being a little deaf, but when he gets used to one's voice it is almost unnoticeable.

An acquaintance of Woronzow's described Hutchinson as "tall, lean, silent and bald-headed."

For a long time no more was known about Hutchinson. But in 1941 a Soviet student of Pushkin, Leonid Grossman, published in the *Vremennik Pushkinskoi Komissii Akademii Nauk SSSR* a short article entitled "Who Was the 'Intelligent Atheist'?" in which he told of the discovery in Woronzow's library of a book by Dr. Hutchinson called *A Dissertation on Infanticide in Its Relations to Physiology and Jurisprudence*. Its first edition appeared in 1820 and was followed by another in 1821. The author dedicated it to the well-known British jurist and Liberal M. P. Sir James Mackintosh. The title-page of the book revealed that its author, Dr. William Hutchinson, was a member of the Paris Medical Society, a Fellow of the Linnean Society and of the Medico-Chirurgical Society in London, and one of the physicians of the Royal Hospital for Children in London. Juxtaposing Pushkin's words about his "intelligent Atheist" and the dedication of the book to such a notorious Radical as Mackintosh, Mr. Grossman jumped to the conclusion that Hutchinson was a man of very advanced political views, and that Pushkin's intercepted letter had an adverse effect on his life, too. Since Hutchinson was a foreigner, said Grossman, it was impossible to exile him, like Pushkin, to the North, but it was still possible, with the help of Woronzow, to remove him from

Russia. This is what actually happened, according to Grossman, who adds that the question of replacing Hutchinson was decided as early as October, 1824. True, from another letter of Woronzow to Longinov (November 17, 1824) we learn that a substitute for Dr. Hutchinson was found in the person of Dr. Lee. In fact the question of Dr. Hutchinson's departure arose as early as August, 1824, though it was not till January, 1825, that Dr. Lee actually replaced him in Odessa. This we learn from a source which to this day remained unknown to Russian students of Pushkin. This source, which enables us to supplement our scanty information about Dr. Hutchinson and to refute Grossman's farfetched hypotheses, is the posthumous two-volume autobiography of another and more famous English physician, Dr. Augustus Bozzi Granville (1783-1872), which appeared in 1874.<sup>1</sup> An Italian by birth (his real name was Bozzi, but he took later, at his mother's wish, his maternal grandmother's name of Granville), he spent his childhood and youth in Italy, and was a passionate Italian patriot and Republican. Arrested by the Lombardian police for his speeches and articles in the *Giornale senza Titolo* against the Austrian Government, he succeeded in emigrating, and for many years led a colorful vagabond life, working as an actor, a surgeon in the Turkish Navy, and a general practitioner in Spain where he joined the Church of England as "a convert from Atheism," and became a surgeon on a British man-of-war. After completing his medical education in Paris he settled down in London where he founded the Children's Hospital at which Dr. Hutchinson was later one of the physicians. He continued throughout his life, even after becoming a British subject, to take an ardent interest in the Italian struggle for independence: in 1814 he addressed an appeal on behalf of Italy to Emperor Alexander of Russia, and later was in close relations with many prominent figures of the Risorgimento.

He became one of the leading British obstetricians and author of numerous medical treatises, owing his successful career in part to the fact of having saved the life of Countess Pembroke, the daughter of Count Simon Woronzow, former Russian Ambassador in London and father of the above-mentioned Woronzow. He became the per-

<sup>1</sup> *Autobiography of A. B. Granville, M. D., F. R. S.—Being Eighty-Eight Years of the Life of a Physician . . .* Edited . . . by . . . Paulina B. Granville, 2 vols., London, 1874.

sonal physician of the elder Woronzow and a friend of the family, and it was he who recommended Dr. Hutchinson to Michael Woronzow.

Granville mentions a letter from Woronzow, dated September 1, 1824, and containing a warm appreciation of Hutchinson's medical services in Odessa. And from Granville's Autobiography we learn the true reasons which compelled Hutchinson to leave Odessa. In a letter to Granville, which the latter quotes in full, written from Belaia Tserkov, the estate of Countess Branicka, Countess Woronzow's mother, and dated September 13, 1824, Hutchinson wrote:

My dear Sir,—I believe I mentioned to you in my last letter that I suffered severe haemoptysis at Odessa. Since that time I have always had more or less cough, difficulty of breathing, and vague pains in the chest, although I confined myself wholly to the house during the winter and spring. During this summer I have several times had more or less haemorrhage from the lungs, and a few weeks ago this occurred to the extent of about one hundred ounces within thirty hours. With such a state of my lungs my life must be of but short duration in so dry and sharp an atmosphere as that of this climate, with its hot summers and severe winters and bitter north winds. This I have just mentioned to Count Woronzow, and I have advised him to seek another physician without delay. He calculates again on your kindness and active and important exertions, and I believe intends to write immediately to Lady Pembroke as well as to yourself about it. It will not be possible for any one to arrive here soon enough to enable me to quit before the winter will be established, and hence I must pass that season here. But I hope my departure will not be delayed longer than the first spring weather. It is for other reasons desirable that whoever replaces me should arrive as soon as possible, as the duration of my life is extremely uncertain, and there is not a physician in this part of Russia in whom the count could have sufficient confidence to place him at ease in regard to the welfare of his family. Every circumstance with regard to my connection with the count's family concurs to render my leaving it a cause of deep regret to me. My sense of duty would have incited me to have made any sacrifice as concerned myself, but in persisting to remain now I should expose the count to the imminent hazard of being suddenly left without any source of adequate medical aid. The count has just mentioned to me that it is a matter of necessity, that whoever replaces me should be acquainted with the practice of midwifery. I ought to mention to you that I have obtained considerable sums of money by practice extraneous to the family of the count, who has also made me considerable presents at different times, so that the regular appointments of the count have not been above half what I have actually acquired. You may make use of this information in your negotiations for my successor.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, ii, 228-229.

Granville adds that he immediately offered Hutchinson's job to Dr. Robert Lee, of Savile Row, a graduate of Edinburgh, who had learned obstetrics from Dr. Hamilton and had attended the practice of midwifery at the Westminster General Dispensary. Dr. Lee accepted and, on being approved by the Countess of Pembroke, left for Odessa where he arrived on January 8, 1825, "to relieve his suffering brother practitioner from a climate that was threatening his existence." At the time Granville wrote, Dr. Lee was "happily alive and well, and still in practice in London," and could therefore vouch for the accuracy of Granville's statement. He published an account of his own journey to Odessa, but, says Granville, "entirely omitted to state the circumstances under which he came to be engaged in that transaction."<sup>3</sup>

We see, then, that the initiative of leaving Russia came from Hutchinson himself. It is not very likely that the illness invoked by him was a mere pretext and that he was removed by Woronzow upon pressure from the Emperor Alexander and his Foreign Minister, Count Nesselrode, as suggested by Grossman. If this were the case Woronzow would hardly have turned once again to Granville who had in the first place recommended him a "dangerous" atheist and who himself had the reputation of a *carbonaro*. But Granville's reference to the possibility of Dr. Lee vouching for the accuracy of his statement suggests that he may not have been unaware of the fact that Hutchinson's departure from Russia had been ascribed to other causes.

Of Hutchinson's subsequent fate we know almost nothing. His name does not figure in the *DNB*. A German medical directory, published in Copenhagen in 1832,<sup>4</sup> mentions him as still being in Russia and in the Russian service (the place of his residence is, however, erroneously given as "Simferopol in the Crimea"). It also lists a French medical article of his, published in 1827. From Michael Woronzow's correspondence with his father we know that in 1825 he transmitted, through his father, a letter to Hutchinson; whether it was written by him, by his wife or by someone else in Odessa we do not know. Nor do we know whether Hutchinson was cured of consumption, or what became of his voluminous work in

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 229-230.

<sup>4</sup> *Medizinisches Schriftsteller-Lexicon der jetzt lebenden Aerzte, Wundärzte, Geburtshelfer, Apotheker und Naturforscher aller gebildeten Völker*. Von Adolph Peter Callisen. Neunter Band: His-Jos. Copenhagen 1832.

defence of atheism, mentioned by Pushkin. Annenkov, who was the first to identify him and who held his information from one of Woronzow's subordinates, a Mr. Levshin, stated that the latter happened to run across Hutchinson in England five years after the Pushkin episode (that is, about 1829), and that, far from being an atheist then, he had become a minister of the Church of England. This statement is not corroborated from any other source. Further investigations in England may throw more light on the career of Pushkin's "deaf philosopher" who preached atheism to him and may have introduced him to Shelley. It should be added that in Pushkin's life atheism was but a passing phase, and that even then his acceptance of it was guarded and somewhat reluctant.

As for Granville, who was responsible for Hutchinson's Russian stay and thus indirectly influenced the course of Pushkin's life, he was himself to visit Russia in 1827, nominally as Countess Woronzow's personal physician, but actually as the Woronzows' guest and friend, which enabled him to gain access to the best society in St. Petersburg and even to the Court. He described his Russian trip and impressions in a two-volume work entitled *St. Petersburgh. A Journal of Travels to and from that Capital through Flanders, the Rhenish Provinces, Prussia, Russia, Poland, Silesia, Saxony, the Federated States of Germany and France* (London, 1828; second edition, 1829). It is one of the most circumstantial and favorable early accounts of Russia, containing a great deal of information about the organisation of medical services in that country. There is no mention in it of the Pushkin-Hutchinson episode. Nor did Granville have a chance of meeting Pushkin in person. But in speaking of the state of literature in Russia he devotes the following paragraph to Pushkin:

It is in poetry, however, that the modern Russians have made more rapid progress, especially in the lyric department. The name of Alexander Pouschkine, the Byron of Russia, is familiar to many English readers. He made his *début* when only fourteen years of age, being then a student at the Imperial Lyceum; and at the age of nineteen he composed the celebrated poem of Rouslan and Ludmilla, superior for beauty to any thing that had been before published in Russia. He has produced since several other works, although not yet in the twenty-ninth year of his age. My literary readers are doubtlessly acquainted with the temporary displeasure which this youthful and ardent lyrical poet excited in the highest quarters, previous

to the accession of Nicholas, by his "Ode to Liberty." The Russians are indebted to him for a translation of Shakespeare's *King Lear*.<sup>5</sup>

The last statement, which is, of course, erroneous (Pushkin's only "translation" from Shakespeare was a much later free adaptation of *Measure for Measure*), had been made, a year earlier, in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* whence Granville probably derived it.

GLEB STRUVE

*University of California, Berkeley*

---

TWO METAPHYSICAL IMAGES IN HOPKINS'S  
"THE WRECK OF THE DEUTSCHLAND"

The fourth stanza in Gerard Manley Hopkins's "The Wreck of the Deutschland" has been widely quoted and admired. At the same time, part of it has puzzled some critical heads.

I am soft sift  
In an hourglass—at the wall  
Fast, but minded with a motion, a drift,  
And it crowds and it combs to the fall;  
I steady as a water in a well, to a poise, to a pane,  
But roped with, always, all the way down from the tall  
Fells or flanks of the voel, a vein  
Of the gospel proffer, a pressure, a principle, Christ's gift.

The first image is as clear as it is excellent. It is the latter half of the stanza that has presented problems. Yet, read in the light of certain passages in the poet's notebooks, the second image becomes as clear as the first. Robert Bridges, though he recognized most of the essential meaning of the passage, obscured this by a misleading place-name association. He printed the following note:

Father Bliss tells me that the Voel is a mountain not far from St. Beuno's College in N. Wales, where the poem was written: and Dr. Henry Bradley that *moel* is primarily an adj. meaning *bald*: it becomes a fem. subst. meaning *bare hill*, and preceded by the article *y* becomes *voel*, in modern Welsh spelt *foel*. This accounts for its being written without initial capital, the word being used generically; and the meaning, obscured by *roped*, is that the well is fed by the trickles of water within the flanks of the mountains.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *St. Petersburg* . . . , 2nd ed., ii, 239-240.

<sup>1</sup> *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Robert Bridges, 2nd ed. (with

Dr. Gardner, in the notes to his new edition of Hopkins's poems, quotes Bridges' note and adds:

To the present editor *roped* suggests the long silvery runnels down the mountain-sides—a common sight in N. Wales after rain. The two metaphysical images (hour-glass and well) convey the idea that as the physical life disintegrates the spiritual life is built up—by faith and grace.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Gardner's first statement is a good guess. His more general second statement I think (for complex reasons that depend upon too much else in the poem to be detailed here) does not represent Hopkins's intended meaning. There is no reference either within the stanza or in its immediate context to a disintegration of the physical life. The idea is rather that the physical image of steadiness and repose on the one hand, combined with abundance and movement on the other, has its parallel in the spiritual world. The whole, so far as the unity of the stanza goes, may be made out easily from the notebooks.

Bridges' note refers to the Voel (or Foel), near St. Beuno's in North Wales, though he observes that Hopkins generalizes the place-name by omitting the initial capital. Hopkins knew the place, certainly. His journal for September 8, 1874, contains a brief entry: "With Fr. Morris up the Foel."<sup>3</sup> But the "voel" in the poem is incidental—it represents the source of the water described but is not itself the focus of the poet's attention—and, as Bridges recognized, it may be any bare hill. The essence of the image is the well, and the origin of this appears to be not simply any well but one of particular interest to Hopkins—that of St. Winefred at Holywell.<sup>4</sup> There is an entry in his journal for October 8 of the same year:

Bright and beautiful day. Crests of snow could be seen on the mountains. Barraud and I walked over to Holywell and bathed at the well and re-

---

introd., etc., by Charles Williams), London, 1933, p. 104. References hereafter to the *Poems* are to this edition unless otherwise noted.

<sup>2</sup> *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. W. H. Gardner, New York and London, 1948, p. 222.

<sup>3</sup> *The Note-Books and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Humphry House, London, 1937, p. 211. Quotations hereafter are from this volume unless otherwise noted.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Poems*, No. 58, "St. Winefred's Well," fragments of a projected drama.

turned very joyously. The sight of the *water in the well as clear as glass*, greenish like beryl or aquamarine, *trembling at the surface with the force of the springs*, and shaping out the five foils of the well quite drew and held my eyes to it. Within a month or six weeks from this (I think Fr. di Pietro said) a young man from Liverpool, Arthur Kent (?), was cured of rupture in the water. The strong unfailing flow of the water and the chain of cures from year to year all these centuries took hold of my mind with wonder at the bounty of God in one of His saints, the sensible thing so naturally and gracefully uttering the spiritual reason of its being (which is all in true keeping with the story of St. Winefred's death and recovery) and *the spring in place leading back the thoughts by its spring in time to its spring in eternity: even now the stress and buoyancy and abundance of the water is before my eyes.* (p. 214).<sup>5</sup>

This passage—written up in the notebook, according to Hopkins's usual practice, at a date probably considerably later than the event recorded and so within less than a year of the inception of the poem in December, 1875—has numerous points of connection with parts of the “Deutschland” that do not concern us here. The idea expressed at its close forms an exact transition between the stanza under discussion and the one that follows. Two years later he wrote to Bridges of St. Winefred and “her famous spring, which fills me with devotion every time I see it and wd. fill anyone that has eyes with admiration, the flow of *ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ* is so lavish and so beautiful. . . .”<sup>6</sup>

But the precise image of the second half of the stanza is still, as Bridges remarked, somewhat “obscured by *roped*.” This image too may be illuminated by considering Hopkins's use of the word elsewhere. *Rope*, occurring as noun, verb, or participle, and used in a metaphorical sense to describe visual phenomena, appears a number of times in the notebooks. Most frequently it refers to cloud formations. Once it refers to wind, twice to water. In all these instances Hopkins uses the word to describe effects of coiling and sinuosity, without any reference to the connecting or tying functions of rope, without reference also to what may be at either

<sup>5</sup> Italics mine in this and subsequent quotations.

Cf. Hopkins's note, Sept. 10, 1874, on his visit to “Ffynnon-y-capel or Ffynnon-Fair . . . , such another well as St. Winefred's. . . .” (p. 211). This well also is described in some detail.

<sup>6</sup> *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges*, ed. Claude Collee Abbott, London, 1935, p. 40.

end of a rope, but referring only to the shape and movement of the phenomenon described.<sup>7</sup>

In a journal entry for July, 1871, Hopkins describes a very large "stack of cloud" which impressed him. It was "in two limbs."

The left was rawly made, a fleece parcelled in wavy locks flowing open upwards, with shady gutturs [sic] between, like the ringlets of a ram's fleece blowing; the right was shapely, *roped like a heavy cable being slowly paid and by its weight settling into gross coils* and beautifully plotted with tortoise-shell squares of shading—indeed much as a snake is plotted. . . . (p. 150).

Shortly before this he had written of a river "swollen and golden and, where charged with air, *like ropes and hills of melting candy*" (p. 149). An entry of November 3, 1873, describes "balks of grey cloud" with "one great dull rope coiling overhead," and a "further balk" made up of "great gutterings and ropings, gilded above" (p. 186). In another passage he records "a leaden sky, *braided or roped with cloud*" (p. 210). Of all the notebooks entries, that which perhaps most clearly illuminates Hopkins's use of *roped* occurs under date of August 16, 1872: "In the narrow channel . . . the churning of the water *roped and changed*, riding this and that, but never got clear of the channel. . . . In watching the sea one should be alive to the oneness which all its motion and tumult receives from its perpetual balance and falling this way and that to its level" (p. 167).<sup>8</sup> The word as used in two of Hopkins's poems appears to have

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Gardner (*Gerard Manley Hopkins*, New Haven, 1948, v. 1, p. 191), who associates the *rope* of the "Deutschland" not only with the "down-flowing rill" of a mountain, as in his note to the poem already quoted above, but also with the rope by means of which water is drawn up from a well, "or as a climber is rescued from 'cliffs of fall.'" The suggestion is a natural one, but I do not think it represents Hopkins's own intended meaning. Cf. also F. R. Leavis (*New Bearings in English Poetry*, London, 1942, pp. 179-80), who interprets the two images as symbolizing two successive experiences rather than as representing two facets of the same thing. Of the hour-glass metaphor he writes: "It conveys perfectly the inner sinking and dissolution, and then (with a subtle shift from sand to water) the steady and recovery." This interpretation, however, ignores and would render pointless the stillness-movement contrast so deliberately expressed in both images—"at the wall / Fast, but *mined* with a *motion*" and "steady as water . . . / *But roped with . . . / a vein. . . .*"

<sup>8</sup> An odd and repulsive picture is given by the use of the word in an entirely different context though still with the same sense: "Under a stone hedge was a dying ram: there ran slowly from his nostril a thick flesh-

much the same meaning, although the image there is perhaps not quite so certain.

Delightfully the bright wind boistrous ropes, wrestles. . . .<sup>9</sup>

A beetling baldbright cloud through England

Riding: there did storms not mingle? and

Hailropes hustle and grind their

Heavengravel? wolfsnow, worlds of it, wind there?<sup>10</sup>

In the stanzas preceding the hour-glass image of the "Deutschland" Hopkins was writing of his own earlier spiritual struggles. These had been brought to an end (at least for the time being) when he found refuge in "the heart of the Host." The images of the hour-glass and the well are used to describe the consequent state of "grace." In the light of Hopkins's associations with St. Winefred's Well and with the word *roped* as revealed in the passages quoted above from his notebooks, the stanza must be interpreted as showing the felicitous union of fixedness (or repose) and motion (or activity) in himself now that he has been dedicated to the service of God. At the wall of the hour-glass the sand is immobile, in repose; but at the center it "crowds" and "combs" to the time-telling motion which its function requires. And—in the next image—his soul is like water in a well, steady, poised, clear, *but* (the particular conjunction is significant) with its surface tremu-

coloured ooze, scarlet in places, coiling and roping its way down so thick that it looked like fat" (p. 174).

<sup>9</sup> "That Nature is a Heraclitean Fire . . .," *Poems*, No. 48, l. 5.

<sup>10</sup> "The Loss of the Eurydice," *Poems*, No. 17, ll. 25-28. Italics mine. *Hailropes* obviously refers not to the falling hail but to its origin in the mingling clouds which "grind" the hail (heavengravel) into being. Cf. W. A. M. Peters (*Gerard Manley Hopkins*, London, 1948, p. 18), who understands the term as referring to the hail itself. In an earlier version of the "Eurydice" the word *grimstones* was used but was dropped, apparently in response to criticism from Bridges. Mr. Abbott says that *grimstones* originally stood in place of *heavengravel* (*Letters to Bridges*, p. 54 and note). According to Peters it was the predecessor of *hailropes*. Not having seen the manuscript (which in any case was not in Hopkins's autograph but was a copy made by Bridges) I am not in a position to say where the original word stood, whether in the place of *hailropes* or of *heavengravel*—but Mr. Abbott is a careful editor. In either case, the sense remains the same. Mr. Peters must be wrong in the meaning he ascribes to *hailropes*, else *heavengravel* would produce an intolerable tautology.

lous or in coils of movement from the springs below<sup>11</sup> that are invisibly fed by grace—"Christ's gift," the "proffer" of the gospel, the "pressure" which is the source of "the stress and buoyancy and abundance of the water."<sup>12</sup>

ELISABETH SCHNEIDER

*Temple University*

### THE REVISION OF DAISY MILLER

When *Daisy Miller* was first published in 1878, many Americans read it with indignation. It was interpreted as "an outrage on American girlhood"; writers on etiquette used Daisy as a horrible example of vulgarity; and William Dean Howells wrote the author that society almost divided itself into Daisy-Millerites and anti-Daisy-Millerites. When James revised this story in 1909 for the New York Edition, he made the ironic discovery that Daisy, far from being a slander, was really an idealized treatment of the American girl. He saw then, as he said he always should have seen, that this work was not at all a critical, realistic study, but was conceived "quite inordinately and extravagantly in poetic terms"; if his Daisy Miller was vulgar as Americans had protested, her prototype was infinitely more vulgar and without her redeeming charm. As he phrased it, "my supposedly typical little figure was of course pure poetry, and had never been anything else; since this is what helpful imagination, in however slight a dose, ever directly makes for."<sup>1</sup>

Freed from the pretense that Daisy was "typical," James in revising the story applied "the helpful imagination" even more than before. Most of the changes which he introduced that have more than a purely stylistic purpose<sup>2</sup> emphasize Daisy's charm, the

<sup>11</sup> See the description quoted above, p. 308, "trembling at the surface with the force of the springs."

<sup>12</sup> Also from the description of the well quoted above, p. 308.

<sup>1</sup> *The Novels and Tales of Henry James* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), xviii, vi-viii.

<sup>2</sup> The stylistic changes are not considered in this article because they are of the same general character as those described in the studies of the revision of *Roderick Hudson* (Harvitt, "How Henry James Revised *Roderick Hudson*," *PMLA*, xxxix, 203-27, March 1924; Havens, "The Revision of *Roderick Hudson*," *PMLA*, xl, 433-4, June 1925); of *The*

disagreeableness of her critics, and the innocence of her conduct. The result is to increase the reader's sympathy for Daisy and to make plainer the meaning of the story. In keeping with these changes, James revised the title. Until then, the story had appeared as *Daisy Miller: a Study*. In his new interpretation of the work, he saw that it never should have been called "a Study" and he conscientiously deleted that qualification.<sup>3</sup>

In revision,<sup>4</sup> he repeatedly inserted comments on Daisy's loveliness or heightened those which already existed. References to her as "the young girl" and "Miss Miller" are changed to "the charming creature" (C1 681, 697; N 8, 42), and "his companion" becomes "his charming charge" (C2 62; N 82). Where the original said "The young lady glanced at him" the revision says "She glanced at him with lovely remoteness" (C1 681; N 9). "Her light, slightly monotonous smile," "her eyes," and "her shoulders" are redescribed more flatteringly as "her clear rather uniform smile," "her sweet eyes," and "her very white shoulders" (C1 684, 681; C2 56; N 16, 9, 69). After being cut by Mrs. Walker at the party Daisy, according to the magazine version, "turned away, looking with a pale, grave face at the circle near the door"; according to the New York Edition, she "turned away, looking with a small white prettiness, a blighted grace, at the circle near the door" (C2 58; N 73).

By associating his heroine with nature imagery, James has not only increased the impression of her attractiveness, but also sug-

*Portrait of a Lady* (Matthiessen, *Henry James: The Major Phrase*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. 152-86); and of *The American* (Gettman, "Henry James's Revision of *The American*," *American Literature*, XVI, 279-95, Jan. 1945).

<sup>3</sup> *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*, xviii, vi.

<sup>4</sup> *Daisy Miller* appeared originally in the *Cornhill Magazine*, xxxvii, 678-98 (June 1878) and xxxviii, 44-67 (July 1878). James revised the story slightly for a book edition published by MacMillan in 1879, but these changes are purely stylistic and have no bearing on the present study. Using the MacMillan 1879 text, James revised thoroughly in 1909 for the so-called New York Edition published by Scribner's, *The Novels and Tales of Henry James*, vol. xviii. Most of the easily available reprints (including Modern Library and Penguin editions) have used a corrupt version of the original text (the Harper edition of 1883).

I have used the following abbreviations: C1 for *Cornhill Magazine*, Vol. xxxvii; C2 for *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. xxxviii; N for New York Edition.

gested the innocent naturalness of her behavior. In one place "his little friend the child of nature of the Swiss lakeside" is substituted for her name (*N* 46; *C2* 44) and in another "that pretty American girl" is changed to "that little American who's so much more a work of nature than of art" (*C2* 60; *N* 79). The young girl's eyes were "singularly honest and fresh" is revised to read "her expression was as decently limpid as the very cleanest water" (*C2* 682; *N* 11). Winterbourne's reflection that "It was impossible to regard her as a perfectly well-conducted young lady" is changed to "It was impossible to regard her as a wholly unspotted flower" (*C2* 51; *N* 59), and in another place "her brilliant little face" is described as "her shining bloom" (*C2* 47; *N* 52). The one most extended introduction of figurative language is in the Colisseum passage where Winterbourne recognizes Daisy's voice. The original reads: "These were the words he heard, in the familiar accent of Miss Daisy Miller." In revision this becomes: "These words were winged with their accent, so that they fluttered and settled about him in the darkness like vague white doves. It was Miss Daisy Miller who had released them for flight" (*C2* 64; *N* 85-6). The romantic atmosphere in which the author is enveloping his heroine and the gentleness and innocent beauty he is attributing to her are revealed in revisions such as these which associate her with white doves, flowers, cleanest water, and the Swiss lakeside.

As Daisy grows more attractive, her critics grow less so. Mrs. Costello, Winterbourne's "exclusive" aunt whose harsh judgment befuddles her nephew's instinctive liking for Daisy, becomes more acid-tongued, indulging habitually in sarcastic exaggerations whose effect is to alienate sympathy, not from Daisy but from a critic so snobbishly disagreeable. The following changes are typical:

"Oh, the mother is just as bad!" (*C1* 688)

"But the skinny little mother's just as bad!" (*N* 24)

"And that . . . is the young person whom you wanted me to know!" (*C1* 698)

"And that . . . is the little abomination you wanted me to know!" (*N* 44)

"The girl goes about alone with her foreigners. . . . She has picked up half-a-dozen of the regular Roman fortune-hunters, and she takes them about to people's houses. When she comes to a party she brings with her

"Well, the girl tears about alone with her unmistakeably low foreigners. . . . She has picked up half a dozen of the regular Roman fortune-hunters of the inferior sort and she takes them about to such houses as

a gentleman with a good deal of manner and a wonderful moustache." (C2 44)

she may put *her* nose into. When she comes to a party—such a party as she can come to—she brings with her a gentleman with a good deal of manner and a wonderful moustache." (N 45-46)

Mrs. Walker, whose cutting of Daisy seals the young girl's social doom, is in the revision given symbolic value by references to her as "the voice of civilised society" (N 62, 63) and "that social critic" (N 67). The author's final judgment on her treatment of Daisy is, in a typical Jamesian fashion, implied in the rewriting of the following passage. Winterbourne is just protesting Mrs. Walker's turning her back on Daisy when the girl came to take leave of her hostess:

"That was very cruel," he said to Mrs. Walker.

"She never enters my drawing-room again!" replied her hostess. (C2 58)

"That was very cruel," he promptly remarked to Mrs. Walker.

But this lady's face was also as a stone. "She never enters my drawing room again." (N 74)

The one word "also" carries the verdict. We need not be told what else was "as a stone."

But the harsh judgments of critics such as these affect Daisy's life and death only indirectly. Although she would like to be respected, she doesn't care enough about these judgments and subsequent slights to make any adjustment in her conduct. Her own standard of what is proper, based on consideration and truer than theirs, prevents her from desiring to accommodate. She does care, though, about the opinion of her Europeanized compatriot, Winterbourne. When she discovers that he condemns her, she has no wish to live. The interpretation of Daisy really hinges on Winterbourne's reaction, for it is through his eyes that we most see her. He is, in both versions, a person of good faith, naturally attracted by Daisy but puzzled by her conduct, and seeking to discover if she is violating convention merely through ignorance or wilfulness, which he could forgive, or if she is innately immoral, which he could not. In revision his feelings are more complex; he is both more in love and more bewildered. The effect is to heighten Daisy's appeal and to bring out more clearly that her conduct is ambiguous only because viewed in the light of Europeanized standards.

The following passages, none of which appear in the original, show how James is building up the effect of Winterbourne's emotional involvement:

The soft impartiality of her *constatations*, as Winterbourne would have termed them, was a thing by itself—exquisite little fatalist as they seemed to make her. (N 27)

Her detachment from any invidious judgment of this was, to her companion's sense, inimitable. (N 28)

... the way that she 'condoned' these things almost melted Winterbourne's heart. (N 53)

He was to continue to find her thus at moments inimitable. (N 72)

Changes such as the following also emphasize her charm for Winterbourne:

... she added slowly, smiling, throwing back her head and glancing at him from head to foot. (C2 52) . . . she put to him with a wonderful bright intensity of appeal. (N 62)

... interposed Daisy. (C2 57) . . . and she made it beautifully unspeakable. (N 71)

He was silent a moment; and then, "Yes, I believe it!" he said. (C2 63) He asked himself, and it was for a moment like testing a heart-beat; after which, "Yes, I believe it!" he said (N 84)

He kept looking at her. (C2) He tried to deny himself the small fine anguish of looking at her, but his eyes themselves refused to spare him. (N 88)

In the revision James makes plain that Daisy is a new experience which Winterbourne doesn't know how to interpret. Where the original says that Daisy gave Winterbourne "a serious glance" or "a single glance," we now find her giving him "he thought, the oddest glance," and "sparing but a single small queer glance for it, a queer small glance, he felt, than he had ever yet had from her" (C1 691; C2 57; N 30; N 72). Appropriately, a reference to him as "a gentleman" is changed to "a foolish puzzled gentleman" (C2 64; N 86). A further revision explains clearly what has happened to him:

He felt that he had lived at Geneva so long that he had lost a good deal. (C1 684) He felt he had lived at Geneva so long as to have got morally muddled. (N 16)

What finally settles for Winterbourne the question of the degree of innocence of Daisy's conduct is her relations with Giovanelli. In revising, James has consistently belittled the Italian suitor, thereby minimizing his importance as a threat to Daisy's virtue. He is made more of a coxcomb, a term which is first applied to him in the revision. Nowhere is he relegated to insignificance more than in the dehumanizing which he undergoes on his first appearance on the scene, where the revision substitutes the neuter pronoun for the masculine and twice denies him humanity by the substitution of "figure" and "thing" for "man."

Winterbourne perceived at some distance a little man standing with folded arms, nursing his cane. He had a handsome face, an artfully poised hat, a glass in one eye and a nosegay in his button-hole. Winterbourne looked at him a moment and then said, "Do you mean to speak to that man?" (C2 49)

Winterbourne descried hereupon at some distance a little figure that stood with folded arms and nursing its cane. It had a handsome face, a hat artfully poised, a glass in one eye and a nosegay in its buttonhole. Daisy's friend looked at it a moment and then said: "Do you mean to speak to that thing?" (N 56)

Consistently Giovanelli is stripped of his dignity. References to him as "the brilliant little Roman," "the inevitable Giovanelli," "the little Italian," and "the subtle Roman" are degraded to "the glossy little Roman," "her coxcomb of the Corso," "the shiny—but, to do him justice, not greasy—little Roman," and "poor Giovanelli" (C2 58, 59, 59, 67; N 74, 75, 77, 92). As a further indignity: instead of "singing" in the revision he has "warbled" (C2 56; N 69). Only Winterbourne, "morally muddled" by his long residence in Europe, can misunderstand Daisy's flirtation with this man of straw.

The reader of the revised version of *Daisy Miller* cannot miss the point that Daisy is as innocent as she is beautiful. James has underlined that she is a charming, spontaneous American girl who is the victim of rigid social conventions. That he was motivated by an ironic intent to make obvious the idealized portrait which early readers mistook for slander is possible but unlikely; that he was influenced by nostalgic recollections of the Americans of his youth is also unlikely, since the introduction shows a more critical view of the real Americans of that time. It seems probable that he merely tried to bring out more clearly the meaning of the situation—to make the reader feel more deeply the pathos of appealing innocence

misjudged by inflexible formalism. In 1909 he was freer to emphasize such meaning than in 1878, when he was limited by the conception that Daisy was "typical" and his work "a Study."

VIOLA R. DUNBAR

*Western Reserve University*

---

### HENRY JAMES' "THE IMPRESSIONS OF A COUSIN"

On January 17, 1881, and May 30, 1883, Henry James jotted down two plans for the story which appeared in *The Century Magazine* for November and December, 1883, as "The Impressions of a Cousin." As he first outlined it, the tale was that of a girl whose trustee robs her of her fortune and, to avoid detection, persuades her to enter a convent. When, however, he comes to love her he is unable to dissuade her, for she had been in love with him and eager to forgive, but is now determined to bury in a cloister the affection of which she is ashamed. Two years later James had the trustee plan to escape exposure, not by putting the heiress in a convent, but by marrying her to his stepbrother. She refuses the offer, and unwilling to marry her dishonoured guardian, "retires, as it were, from the world with her property, her wound and her secret. The 'Cousin' of the title is a young woman who relates the story (in the form of a journal). . . . She herself of course to be a 'type.'"

The editors of James' *Notebooks* comment:

Telling the story by means of the journal of the 'observer' makes it essentially a narrative in the first person, and James' objections to this method, expounded later in his preface to *The Ambassadors*, apply here. The 'observer' becomes more vivid than the other characters, and James' feeling that the theme was 'rather thin' and 'wanting in actuality' seems justified, partly because the other characters can be seen only through the eyes of a woman who is herself, although intelligent, unable, without falling out of character, to reveal herself and the others fully in the pages of a journal.<sup>1</sup>

But have not Professors Matthiessen and Murdock been misled by the preliminary sketches and failed to see that these have a different center of interest from the published story? After outlining the

<sup>1</sup> *The Notebooks of Henry James*, ed. F. O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock, New York, 1947, p. 53.

tale for the second time, James commented: "I have lost my fancy for the theme, which is rather thin and conventional, and wanting in actuality." Then it seems to have occurred to him to make the story of the defrauded heiress subsidiary to that of her dependent cousin, who thinks of herself and appears to the reader as a mere onlooker, a person to whom nothing is expected to happen. Here was drama of the sort that appealed to him and nothing of the conventionality and obviousness, which, as he told his nephew, he "hated." Of *Roderick Hudson* he wrote: "The center of interest throughout . . . is in Rowland Mallet's consciousness, and the drama is the very drama of that consciousness."<sup>2</sup> Now Rowland Mallet, it will be recalled, appears to be merely an onlooker, a negative person in the background of *Roderick Hudson's* and *Christina Light's* story. In "The Impressions of a Cousin," in order to shift the center of interest to the diarist, James makes the stepbrother of the defaulting trustee more important throughout, has him fall in love, not with the heiress whom ostensibly he courts, but with her cousin the diarist. She has no suspicion of his feelings, but returns them when she learns that he has given all his property to his stepbrother (the trustee) to make good what had been stolen. The gradual, unconscious self-revelation of the diarist's character and personality is one of the best things in the story. At first she is unattractive, a self-centered spinster who has lived so long in Rome that she finds "nothing to sketch" or indeed to like in New York; but these prejudices fade as the real stuff of which she is made appears: her honesty, realism, loyalty, unselfishness, and sound sense of values. One of her likeable characteristics is a growing appreciation of the naive, blushing stepbrother, whom she calls "stupid" but eventually comes to love. James was fond of such heroes, as *The Spoils of Poynton*, *A London Life*, and perhaps Lord Warburton in *The Portrait of a Lady* show. Did he choose them merely for contrast, or do they represent a tribute from the most sophisticated and subtle of novelists to the charm and rightness of simple, "nice" men?

Of the heiress, Professors Matthiessen and Murdock say: "She knows that she has been cheated by Caliph, but that he has somehow been able to make restitution, and there is a typically Jamesian hint that her love for him is lessened as soon as loving him in-

<sup>2</sup> James, *The Art of the Novel* (New York, 1934), p. 16.

volves no sacrifice and little need for forgiveness." But this comment also seems to be based on the Notebooks rather than on the printed tale. In the latter, the stepbrother has enabled the trustee to restore the funds he has stolen and the heiress, who does not know this or that she has been cheated, has apparently persuaded herself that her trustee has been honest. To be sure, in the diarist's opinion, "It was sweeter for her to suffer at Mr. Caliph's hands than to receive her simple dues from them" and "with the washing away of his stains, the color has been quite washed out of his rich physiognomy."<sup>3</sup> But the heiress had loved him long before her love had involved any sacrifice or need for forgiveness, and what lessened it was the loss, not of opportunity for sacrifice and forgiveness, but of respect for him.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

### JEAN DE MEUN AN ENGLISHMAN?

In the essay "On the Old English Poets and Poetry" which appeared in the *Muses' Mercury* for June, 1707—"the first attempt," says Professor D. Nichol Smith, "at a popular account of our early poetry"<sup>1</sup>—one finds many strange things, but none so astonishing as a certain digression which has more to do properly with French than English poetry. The anonymous author, almost certainly the Queen Anne party writer John Oldmixon,<sup>2</sup> has been sketching the

<sup>1</sup> "The Impressions of a Cousin" in *Tales of Three Cities* (Boston, 1884), p. 113. It should be noted that the diarist is mistaken on at least two other points: she believes that Mr. Caliph, knowing the heiress to be in love with him, "in that . . . saw his opportunity to fleece her" (p. 84); whereas he had not suspected her love for him (pp. 115-16). Again, she mistakenly asserts that Mr. Caliph is deceiving her when, at the garden-party, he says he had not seen his brother and "had no idea what had become of him" (p. 89, cf. p. 99).

<sup>2</sup> *Warton's History of English Poetry* (British Academy Lecture, 1929), p. 14. Cf. René Wellek, *The Rise of English Literary History* (Chapel Hill, 1941), pp. 160-1.

<sup>3</sup> See R. P. McCutcheon, "Addison and the *Muses' Mercury*," *SP*, xx (1923), 17-28. E. K. Broadus, "Addison's Influence on the Development of Interest in Folk-poetry," *MP*, viii (1910), 124 n. 1, offers Steele, but Wellek, *op. cit.*, p. 228, finds McCutcheon and Oldmixon "more convincing."

activities of Marot, Ronsard and Malherbe as "Reformers of the French Tongue."

As for their *Romance of the Rose*, of which they talk as much as we do of *Chaucer's Poems*, we have more Right to it than they, for the Author was an *Englishman*, his Name *John Moon*: He was a Student in *Paris*, and there writ that Poem, which *Chaucer* translated into *English*.<sup>3</sup>

This reads like just another of the many quaintnesses in Oldmixon's piece, and Professor Smith is rightly amused, but there really did exist in sixteenth-, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England a surprisingly ramified tradition that Jean de Meun was an expatriate Englishman. The vitality of this tradition may be taken, I think, as an index of the lack of knowledge about Old French literature in England.

So prevalent, in fact, was this error as to Jean de Meun's nationality that Oldmixon might have had it from any one of several authorities. In his account of Chaucer and Gower, the essayist quotes with broad editorial license from an unnamed "old Historian,"<sup>4</sup> who proves to be John Pits. At the end of Pits' catalogue of Chaucer's works in the unfinished *Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis* (1619) this note is inserted:

Joannis Mone Angli librum de arte amandi quem Parisiis Gallice scripsit, [Chaucer] in versos Anglicos transtulit, & operi in titulum dedit The Romaunt of the rose.<sup>5</sup>

Again, Oldmixon's source for his English John Moon might possibly have been the compendium assembled by John Hughes but known as Kennet's *Complete History of England*. Here one finds the same information, but in slightly more concrete terms. John Moon appears as "John Mohun," who in the time of Richard II attended the University of Paris and "wrote the Romance of the Rose in French, and 'twas translated by Gefferey Chaucer."<sup>6</sup>

Actually Oldmixon did not derive John Moon from Pits or from Kennet's John Mohun, but rather from Rymer's preface to his translation of Rapin's *Reflections on Aristotle's Treatise of Poesie* (1674). Rymer has neither Moon nor Mohun, but speaks of "the Author of the Roman of the Rose," whom, though he may be an Englishman, Rymer leaves "for the French to boast of, because he

<sup>3</sup> P. 128.

<sup>5</sup> P. 175.

<sup>4</sup> P. 130.

<sup>6</sup> Published 1706, I, 288.

writ in their Language. . . .”<sup>7</sup> It was Rymer’s preface, there can be little doubt, which suggested to Oldmixon both the method and thesis of his minuscule literary history. Oldmixon’s journalistic knowledge that the French “talk” so appreciatively of the *Roman* came from Rymer’s semi-scholarly digest of French critical opinion; both frame the *Roman* with the same context.

But what of John Moon? Rymer, as a scholium indicates, had read Pasquier and Du Bellay on the *Roman de la Rose*, and it is, therefore, with a hint of scepticism that he refers (in a parenthesis) to Sir Richard Baker’s making the author of the *Roman* an Englishman. Nothing could have been handier to Oldmixon than Baker’s *Chronicle of the Kings of England*, the favorite historical work of the Restoration,<sup>8</sup> one of the few books, Leslie Stephen tells us, which every cultivated squire of the period kept in his parlor.<sup>9</sup> Penultimate in the list of illustrious subjects of Richard II trots John Moone “an Englishman, but a Student in Paris, [who] compiled in the French Tongue the Romant of the Rose, translated into English by Geoffrey Chaucer.” Of the ninety-three authorities used by Baker, it is the one nearest the main-travelled road of literary scholarship, Holinshed’s *Chronicle* (1577), which furnished him with “John Moone, an Englishman borne, but a student in Paris . . .” to muster among the notables of the reign of Richard II.<sup>10</sup>

To go beyond the Holinshed compilers, we turn inevitably to John Bale’s catalogues. The first, *Illustrium Majoris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium* (1548), yields nothing. In the more complete *Scriptorum Illustrium Majoris Britanniae Catalogus* (1557-9) there is no trace of John Moon in the main body of the work, but the ample “paralipomena” and appendices are more rewarding. At last John Moon Englishman surrenders himself in his formal Latin garb:

<sup>7</sup> Sig. A 5 v. Cf. Étienne Pasquier, *Les Recherches de la France* (Paris, 1621), VII, 603: “Guillaume de Lorry, & sous Philippe le Bel Jean de Mehum, lesquels quelques uns des nostres ont voulu comparer à Dante Poète Italien: Et moy je les opposerois volontiers à tous les Poëtes d’Italie.”

<sup>8</sup> Published 1653 and five times thereafter in the seventeenth century.

<sup>9</sup> *English Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1904), p. 36.

<sup>10</sup> II, 1118.

Ioannes Mone, Anglus natione, cupidissimus suam excolendi mentem bonis studiis, relicta sua patria, in Gallias, Lutetiamque Parisiorum rectâ se contulit. Ubi post cognitam Dialecticam, quae moderatrix est rationum, Philosophiam & alias artes professus, non sine emolumento plane maximo, in illis excrevit. Qui tandem volens ingenii specimen dare, ex Ovidio Nasone et aliis authoribus collegit, & in Gallico sermone valde eleganter edidit.

*De arte amandi*, Lib. 1

Quem Galfridus Chaucer, poeta insignis, & Anglicae linguae illustrator maximus, in Anglica metra transtulit, titulum addens operi, the Romaunt of thae rose. Anno Domini 1390 claruisse fertur.<sup>11</sup>

In the first ten "centuries" of Bale's catalogue, no source is given for his brief biographies. The items in the appendices, however, usually bear brief source tags, such as "*Ex Beda*," "*Ex Bibliothecis Londini*," "*Ex Lelando*," etc. The source for Joannes Mone is a rare one, indeed, a nonce source, "*Ex Chauorro*." As with other nonce readings, one suspects a misprint; the reading that most readily suggests itself is "*Ex Chaucero*." Chaucer the source of John Moon? Jean de Meun is not mentioned by name anywhere in Chaucer, nor in the sections of the *Romaunt of the Rose* not now generally considered his. Chaucer, nonetheless, is the correct emendation.

Among the Selden manuscripts in the Bodleian is the sheaf of notes, arranged in commonplace-book fashion, which Bale jotted down between 1549 and 1557 in preparation for his expanded catalogue. The manuscript was arbitrarily entitled *Index Britanniae Scriptorum* when Reginald Lane Poole edited it for the *Anecdota Oxoniensis*.<sup>12</sup> On folio 116 of the *Index* one finds:

Ioannes Mone, artium liberalium magister, Gallicè scripsit, The Romaunt of the Rose, li. i. Quem librum Galfridus Chaucer in Anglicum transtulit.

Ex volumine Chauceri, fo. 362.<sup>13</sup>

The edition of Chaucer used by Bale for this particular entry was John Reynes' printing of the Thynne text (1542), for at page 362 of that edition, the reader is in the midst of Hoccleve's *Letter of*

<sup>11</sup> Pt. II, 58. Dr. D. C. Allen has pointed out to me the abbreviation of this passage in Josias Simler's augmented edition of Konrad Gesner's *Bibliotheca* (Zurich, 1574), p. 396. Without authority, Simler gives 1360 as the date of *De arte amandi*; he does not mention Chaucer's translation.

<sup>12</sup> Medieval and Modern Series XII [for IX?] (Oxford, 1892).

<sup>13</sup> *Index*, p. 23. For editions of Chaucer used by Bale see p. 75, n. 3.

*Cupid*—regularly printed in the black letter editions of Chaucer—and comes upon

To mayster Johan de Moone, as I suppose,  
Than it was a lewde occupacioun  
In makyng of the Romante of the Rose. . . .<sup>14</sup>

From these verses came the groundwork for Bale's *Joannes Mone*. The connection of *De arte amandi* and the *Roman de la Rose*, Bale drew, almost certainly, from John Leland, whose unpublished manuscripts on the British authors came into his hands after the antiquarian's death. "Hoc opus," Anthony Hall complained, ". . . foede commaculatum atque interpolatum in suas Centurias traduxit."<sup>15</sup> Leland in the catalogue of Chaucer's work listed "De Arte amandi alias *Romaunce of the Rose*,"<sup>16</sup> which Bale in his Chaucer section reduced to "De arte Amandi, Romane" and identified more precisely by translating the first line into Latin.<sup>17</sup> Leland's label was prompted, I conjecture, by a few lines early in Chaucer's translation: ". . . this book . . . / It is the Romance of the Rose, / In which al the art of love I close."<sup>18</sup> Ovid nowhere enters Leland's account; given *De arte amandi* Bale made the obvious associations.<sup>19</sup>

The other details of the entry and John Moon's nationality, one must conclude, Bale spun out of scattered suggestions he found in Leland's *Commentarii*. His own notes gave him little to go on,

<sup>14</sup> Ll. 281-3. As Paul Meyer discovered, Hoccleve's poem is a jumbled translation of Christine de Pisan's *Epistre au Dieu d'Amours*, a salvo in the "querelle du *Roman de la Rose*"; see F. J. Furnivall ed., *Hoccleve's Works* (London, 1892), I, xi. De Lorris, of course, had not displeased Cupid and, therefore, was not mentioned.

<sup>15</sup> John Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*, Anthony Hall, ed. (Oxford, 1709), sig. A 4 r.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 424. In his own notes (*Index*, p. 76) Bale calls the *Romaunt* "De rose pulchritudine."

<sup>17</sup> *Catalogus*, Pt. I, 525.

<sup>18</sup> Ll. 37, 39-40.

<sup>19</sup> Note that "sotil Ovyde" and his "Remedye of Love" are specifically denounced by Cupid in his letter—ll. 204-5, 246. Cf. Jean Bouchet, *Les Annales d'Aquitaine* (Paris, 1545), p. 82: "Il [Jean de Meun] translata de Latin en Francoys . . . Ovide de arte amandi, dont il se fust bien passé." If such a translation ever existed, it is not now extant; see Langlois, I, 24. Is Bouchet recording a tradition which originated in the same way as Leland's and Bale's error?

but the mind which expanded "mayster" to "artium magister liberalium" and finally to a glowing recital of scholastic achievements needed little stimulation. Leland has no Joannes Mone, but catalogues many an author who "relictis scholis patriis, contulit se ad famosam Parisiorum Academiam."<sup>20</sup> In skimming the hundred biographies between Roger Bacon and William of Ockham,<sup>21</sup> I note some twenty to whom this formula might be applicable. For an Englishman who wrote significant French poetry while a student in Paris, John Moon had a precedent in Grosseteste,<sup>22</sup> and in Leland's explaining away the suspicious surname of Matthew Paris,<sup>23</sup> Bale would have been taught to gloss over the "de Moone" he found in Hoccleve. So well did Bale articulate these *disjecta membra*, whether gathered out of Leland or fancy, and so pleasing was the result, that his creature sped nimbly down the years from catalogue to chronicle to fashionable periodical.

At about the time John Moon, thanks to Bale and Holinshed's chronicle, was gaining currency in England, he was being harried into limbo in France. André Thévet published in his *Vrais Portraits* (1584)<sup>24</sup> a life of Jean Clopinel—so he prefers to call Jean de Meun—which makes a good thing of Bale's attempt to "ravir à nostre France le Roman de la Rose."<sup>25</sup> This crude theft (Thévet implies) should awaken Frenchmen to what a treasure they are neglecting, for here is Englishman Bale, who has before him "les plus belles roses, qu'il pût jamais soit en France, Allemagne ou Espagne, pour reparer sa patrie," and fixes on the *Roman de la Rose*. But Thévet's volumes, it would seem, lay too far off the path of Englishmen requiring information on Old French literature.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>20</sup> *Commentarii*, p. 280.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 257-325.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 283.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 269.

<sup>24</sup> Republished in 1670 and again in 1695 as *Histoire des plus illustres et savans hommes de leurs siècles*. I have used the 1695 edition.

<sup>25</sup> VII, 65.

<sup>26</sup> Pasquier's *Recherches* and Claude Fauchet's *Recueil* (1581) were the standard works referred to by English scholars. Pasquier's few pages on the *Roman* prompted Rymer to dissociate himself from the John Moon tradition. John Urry in his edition of Chaucer (1721) used Fauchet and Ménage (see sig. Fl r), and seems to have been the first Chaucerian editor to recognize de Lorris' part in the *Roman de la Rose*.

When Thomas Warton was writing the first volume of his *History of English Poetry* (1774), John Moon was still passing current. Thomas Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* (1748), a bibliographical aid which Warton used with scrupulous deference,<sup>27</sup> listed Joannes Mone and reproduced an uncritical digest of Bale's entry.<sup>28</sup> This pitfall Warton did not altogether escape; one does meet John Moon, though only in a footnote. Warton points out as a curiosity that "Occleve . . . calls John of Moon the author of the Romaunt of the Rose."<sup>29</sup> "John of Moon" here is the fictitious person soberly recorded by Tanner. To W. Carew Hazlitt editing Warton in 1871, John of Moon was so completely unknown (and for good reason) that he assumed a misprint and altered "Moon" to "Meun."<sup>30</sup> In this petty blunder—Hazlitt's version makes the note inexact and pointless—John Moon was finally banished from literary history.

ALBERT B. FRIEDMAN

*Harvard University*

#### THE BIRTH-DATE OF MICHAULT TAILLEVENT

A few years ago, in publishing two poems of Michault Taillevent,<sup>1</sup> I had occasion to mention the date of his birth. Since, at that time, the question of the exactness of dating was of no particular importance, I accepted Champion's suggestion of 1400-1410.<sup>2</sup> Later studies in connection with the preparation of editions of other works of this poet have, however, brought about more specific consideration of the problem and, as a result of a combination of factors, I believe that it is possible to set the date of Taillevent's birth back to the period 1395-1397.

First of all, Taillevent himself has given a clue as to the approxi-

<sup>27</sup> Smith, *Warton's History*, p. 7.

<sup>28</sup> P. 530. The reference to Bale is incorrect.

<sup>29</sup> I, 369, note c.

<sup>30</sup> P. 318, note 4.

<sup>1</sup> Winthrop H. Rice, "Two Poems of Michault Taillevent: *le Congié d'amours* and *la Bien Allee*," *MP*, XLII (1944), 1-8.

<sup>2</sup> Pierre Champion, *Histoire poétique du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, H. Champion, 1923, I, 338, n. 1. Champion says "un peu avant 1410."

mate age at which he composed his last and best work, the *Passe-temps Michault*, when he says, in strophe LXXVI (vv. 526-532):

J'ay tant passé & voiagé  
Sans aler jusques a Cartaige,  
Dieu mercy, que me voy aage  
Et venu jusques au quart aage.  
Encoree passé le quar[t] ay-je,  
531 Et suis au quint tost arrivé:  
Vieillesse ung clou tost a rivé.<sup>3</sup>

Of the twelve manuscript versions and one early print (c. 1530) whose texts I have—there is another manuscript of which the microfilm has not yet arrived—seven use the word *tout* in v. 531, five have *tost*, and one manuscript reads:

Et suis près du quint arrivé.

Even in the versions using *tost* (probably for the sake of the rhyme), the tense of the verb indicates an accomplished fact and *tost* may here have the implication of "recently." In other words, at the time of writing, Taillevent has already passed through the "fourth age" and has arrived at the "fifth."

The question immediately arises as to the significance of these numerical adjectives. Champion, commenting on this strophe, says: "Michault avait donc dépassé la cinquantaine quand il composa son traité."<sup>4</sup> It is difficult to determine what system, if any, Taillevent was using to count the "ages of man." From a strictly mathematical point of view, of course, it would seem that the count by decades was indicated, and that Taillevent would then have been not in his fifties but in his forties, i. e. in his fifth decade of life. This, however, is unlikely for at least two reasons: first, such an absolute conception of time is not characteristic of the author, whose ideas tend toward vagueness of outline and tenuousness of relationship one with the other; second, there are, in other parts of this same poem, two or three other systems of reckoning the ages of man.

In strophes LXIII to LXX, there is a rather extended passage wherein Michault tells us that he has passed through "le prin-

<sup>3</sup> B. N., nouv. acq. fr. 4512, f. 33ro. Italics mine. While this version of the *Passe-temps* is not the basic ms. of my proposed edition, it is chosen here for the relatively greater clarity of its version of this strophe as a whole when compared to that of the others.

<sup>4</sup> Champion, *op. cit.*, I, 338.

temps," "l'esté," and apostrophizes "autompne, saison tresnoble," as follows:

Hé! autompne, saison tresnoble,  
 Saison qu'on ne peut trop loer,  
 Plaine de blé & de vinoble,  
 Pour ses jours en joie aloe,  
 Sans riens en mes marchés loer  
 Je t'ay passé; en l'iver entre:  
 De vuit garde mengier, vuit ventre.<sup>5</sup>

And at the opening of strophe LXX (v. 484), he states specifically, "L'iver, que vieillesse j'entens. . . ." Thus, in this poem whose topic is the horror of the combination of Old Age and Poverty, he equates Old Age with the winter of life—not an original nor very striking equation, but one which gives an entirely different conception of the ages of man from the one first treated above.

In the strophe immediately following that in which Michault had spoken of the "quint aage," there appears to be a third possible concept. The strophe begins:

Des aages sens au dos l'absence,—  
 Je suis oultré, c'est vérité—  
 Infans, puer, adolescence,  
 Juventute, virilité . . .<sup>6</sup>

This enumeration of five ages does not, I believe, refer to the preceding strophe, but rather points to a reckoning which would involve six, rather than five, ages. The clue lies in the first line. Here the poet, reversing what might be the expected procedure, conceives the idea of having begun life with six(?) ages "on his shoulders." One by one they have gone, and he lists the ones of which he no longer feels the weight. *Virilité* is obviously not the "quint aage" of v. 531, for the whole poem is full of the regrets he has for his lost virility or vigor of mature manhood. There is left on the poet's shoulders only one more "age" and that is the one which is the subject of his discourse: *Vieillesse*.

In neither of the last two methods of denoting the ages of man is there any definite indication of age in years. They are mentioned here primarily to show that Taillevent was not thinking of his age in specific, almost mathematic terms. In looking once more at the

<sup>5</sup> Ms. cit., f. 32ro, vv. 456-462.

<sup>6</sup> Ms. cit., f. 32vo, vv. 533-536.

terms "quart aage" and "quint aage," it seems quite within the realm of probability that the equation being made was with the terms "quarante" and "cinquante" whose roots naturally carry an association with *quatre* and *cinq* and hence with *quart* and *quint*. Champion, then, was probably correct in making his statement that Michault had already entered his fifties at the time that he composed the *Passe-temps*. There was not, so far as I have been able to determine, any fixed, set system of reckoning man's ages at the time that Taillevent was writing, so that each poet or writer was free to use any or as many systems as he wished.

The next question, of course, is that of the date of the *Passe-temps Michault*. It was composed, in all probability, between 1445 and 1447. Certainly, 1450 is the latest *terminus ad quem* possible. Pierre Chastellain, later known as Vaillant, was the author of an answer to Taillevent's work in a poem variously called *le Contre passe-temps Michault* and *le Temps perdu*.<sup>7</sup> Near the end of this poem, in vv. 493-494, Chastellain says:

Je croy que le pardon de Rome  
Que j'atens me fera du bien.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Not to be confused with a later poem, *le Temps recouvré*, dated by Piaget as of 1451. Cf. A. Piaget, "Le Temps recouvré, poème de Pierre Chastellain composé à Rome en 1451," *Atti del Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche*, IV (1904), parte secondo, 37-44.

<sup>8</sup> Bibl. de l'Arsenal, ms. 3521, f. 245vo. There are numerous manuscripts and some printings of the text, but no critical edition. It is found, among other places, in a slightly incomplete version from Stockholm ms. V.u. 23 (formerly LV), ff. 72ro-81ro; and in Jules Petit, *Le Pas de la mort, poème inédit de Pierre Michault*, Bruxelles, Olivier, 18696 (Société des Bibliophiles de Belgique, 2) pp. lxiii-lxxx. The biographical material in this introduction has long since been corrected and the attribution of *Le Pas de la mort* to Pierre Michaut has been disproved. *Le Pas de la mort* was written by Amé de Montgesoie, a contemporary of Pierre Michaut. (Cf. the articles of Thomas Walton in *Medium Aevum*, II (1933), 1-33 and *Annales de Bourgogne*, II (1930), 134-158.) Manuscript 946 of the Bibliothèque de Besançon contains a much earlier reference to Montgesoie as author of *Le Pas de la mort* in an item entitled *Bibliothèque Séquanoise* by one Ferdinand Lampinet, dated 1709:

"Amédée de Montgesoie, seigneur du village de ce nom, dans le resort d'Ornans, gentilhomme de nom et d'armes, avoit composé un livre françois intitulé *Le pas de la mort*, lequel est fort louangé par Olivier de la Marche dans son poème du *Chevalier délibéré*, qui est le seul endroit où il soit parlé de cet ouvrage, dont il ne reste aucune mémoire que celle qui en est

The well-known "grand pardon de Rome" to which the poet here refers took place in 1450. Chastellain is known to have attended it with certain interesting results which, however, have no bearing here. The tone of what he says about this event in the *Temps perdu* is one of anticipation, that is to say, it indicates that the poem was written before he set out for Rome, and consequently must have been done in 1449.<sup>9</sup> But this poem is an answer to Taillevent's as is shown conclusively by the opening lines and the closing line:

En contemplant mon temps passé  
Et le Passe-temps de Michault . . .  
Prens en gré Michault Taillevent.<sup>10</sup>

Further evidence that Chastellain was using Taillevent as a model—if any is necessary—lies in the use of the identical, though rather unusual, form: seven-line strophes, rhyming *ababbcc* and ending in a quasi-proverb. This imitation would, in turn, mean that the *Passe-temps Michault* had been finished and had become known before Chastellain undertook his work. We can only guess at how long this would be, but it seems safe to say that Taillevent had completed his poem no later than 1448.

But the date of composition of the *Passe-temps Michault* can be

conservée dans ce poème. Olivier de la Marche ne nous dict pas en quel temps Amédée vivoit, c'est pourquoy ayant escript dans le quinsième siècle, nous mettons Amédée de Montgesoie entre les autheurs du quatorsième. Les armes de la maison de Montgesoie estoient de geulle au chef endanché de quatre pièces d'or, chargées chaquene d'une croix recroisettée de geulle" (f. 80ro).

<sup>9</sup> The first official announcement of the Jubilee of 1450, was made by a French Archbishop at a council of Cardinals on January 19, 1449. Cf. Ludwig Pastor, *The History of the Popes, from the close of the Middle Ages, drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other original sources*, trans. & ed. by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus, London, Herder, II, 1902, 2nd. ed., 74-75. It is highly probable that people were looking forward to such an event even before the official announcement, since this was a more or less regular celebration occurring at least every fifty years and sometimes every twenty-five.

<sup>10</sup> Arsenal, ms. 3251, f. 237ro., vv. 1-2; f. 245vo., v. 511. The dating of this poem by Piaget as of 1440 (*Romania*, XVIII (1889), 443, and XXXIV (1905), 428) has been effectively challenged by Champion (*op. cit.*, I, 345, n. 2). Chastellain could not have spoken of the Jubilee of 1450 much earlier than the date given in the previous note.

set back even further because of the mention of it by another poet, Pierre de Hauteville, Prince d'amour. It has been well established, especially by Piaget and Droz,<sup>11</sup> that Pierre de Hauteville was the author of the *Confession et Testament de l'amant trespassé de dueil* found in the *Jardin de Plaisance*.<sup>12</sup> In one of the manuscripts of this poem, there is an *Inventaire* of the goods left by the departed lover in which is found listed a copy of the *Passe-temps Michault*. Pierre de Hauteville is known to have died on June 10, 1448,<sup>13</sup> so that there is reason, then, to assume that Taillevent's poem must have been written in 1447 or earlier. Thus it is possible, allowing time for the composition, copying and promulgation of the work, to date the *Passe-temps Michault* as of the period 1445-1447.

Obviously, through the combination of this dating with Taillevent's own admission to the age of at least fifty at the time he wrote it, the placing of his birth-date between 1395 and 1397 becomes automatic.<sup>14</sup>

WINTHROP H. RICE

*Syracuse University*

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Jardin de Plaisance et Fleur de Rhetorique*, éd. A. Piaget et E. Droz, Paris, SATF, II (1924, Introduction et Notes), 305-318; and Winthrop H. Rice, *The European Ancestry of Villon's Satirical Testaments*, Syracuse (N. Y.), Syracuse University Press, 1941, pp. 192-207.

<sup>12</sup> *Ed. cit.*, I (1910, reproduction en fac-similé de l'édition publiée par Antoine Vérard vers 1502), ff. ccxliij-cclvij.

<sup>13</sup> On the life of Pierre de Hauteville cf., in addition to the works cited in note 12: A. de la Grange, "Pierre de Hauteville et ses Testaments," *Annales de l'Académie d'archéologie de Belgique*, XLVI, 4e série, VI (Anvers, 1890), 23-33; and Max Prinet, "Les Sceaux et le Seing manuel de Pierre de Hauteville, prince d'amour," *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, LXXVII (1916), 428-438.

<sup>14</sup> Mr. John H. Watkins, of the University of North Wales, has recently completed a dissertation on Michault Taillevent. He informs me, in a personal letter, that he also has set the date of Taillevent's birth as "about 1395." I do not know upon what basis he has reached this conclusion, and I wish to stress here the fact that both of us have arrived at approximately the same date for Taillevent's birth absolutely independently. It is to be hoped that Mr. Watkins' dissertation will soon be published.

## BRANTÔME'S INTEREST IN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

Pierre de Bourdeille, sieur de Brantôme, is known today as the prime gossip of sixteenth century France. Living close to ladies and gentlemen of high position, gifted with a phenomenal memory for persons and places and incidents (confirmed and unconfirmed), he left at his death in 1614 a voluminous series of *mémoires* concerning courtly life during the French Renaissance.<sup>1</sup> His writings are interesting and entertaining even when the story is almost too tall, and regardless of whether he is talking about feminine attire at the court, tricks in duelling, or Spanish oaths and bluster. It would be expected that a commentator such as he might admire the lustiness of his age, the physical prowess and swordsmanship, the great military captains. This he does. However, scattered throughout this multi-colored composition of Brantôme's is to be found, too, an admiration for the man of letters and for the person who is gifted in the practical use of foreign languages. Brantôme also pays respect to the monarchs of his age who have encouraged arts and letters and the practitioners thereof.

Brantôme shows throughout his chronicle that he was well acquainted with the poets of his time. He mentions, for example, M. de Pomperant who killed the seigneur of Chissay in a duel at Amboise—and says that Marot wrote a *rondeau* about it, from which Brantôme quotes two verses.<sup>2</sup> Brantôme spends several pages in telling of the exploits and glorious death of the Chevalier Bayard, and says that Ronsard praised him in *Le Temple de Messeigneurs le Connestable et des Châtillons*.<sup>3</sup> Brantôme gives praise to Pierre Strozzi, a *grand capitaine étranger* and marshal

<sup>1</sup> The edition of Brantôme that I have used for reference is that published by Lalanne in eleven volumes—Brantôme, *Oeuvres complètes*, publiées . . . par Ludovic Lalanne (Paris, Librairie de la Société de l'Histoire de France, 1864-82). All indications will be to this edition.

<sup>2</sup> From this *rondeau*, *De la mort de Monsieur de Chissay*, Brantôme quotes the lines:

Dont ung chascung de deuil ses lèvres mord,  
Disant: Hélas! l'honneste homme est-il mort?

(Brantôme, I, 255)

<sup>3</sup> Brantôme, *op. cit.*, II, 389.

of France in 1554, because he knew the Ancients so well. Strozzi was so well versed in Classical languages that he made a translation of Caesar's *Commentaries* from Latin into Greek, a translation that received the commendation of Ronsard and Daurat. Brantôme confesses his own linguistic inadequacies, however, and admits that he could not read it.<sup>4</sup>

One of the best known passages in Brantôme's work is the one in which he treats of "le grand roy François I," who through his "vertus, valeurs, beaux faitz et hauts mérites" was called the father and restorer of arts and letters:

Il fut appellé père et le vray restaurateur des arts et des lettres; car, paradvant lui, l'ignorance tenoit lieu quelque peu en France, encor qu'il y eust certes paradvant quelques gens savans. . .<sup>5</sup>

Francis, while he was King, sent scholars out to "pérégriner aux régions étranges à ses dépens . . . pour faire recherche des livres à nous incognus, et papiers et instrumens d'antiquité."<sup>5</sup> Brantôme thinks all this was most admirable. Also it laid the foundations for the library at Fontainebleau, "dont M. Budé, l'un des doctes personnages de la chrestienté,"<sup>5</sup> was one time the guardian. Francis I was in truth, says Brantôme, greatly influenced by the *savants*, men in "robes longues." Brantôme finds no objection to this, but he does feel that a man of the sword might make a better ambassador than a man of letters.<sup>5</sup> Many illustrations are brought forward to prove this point.

Henri II, says Brantôme, was a great patron of scholars and poets even as was his father, Francis I, and he had the good fortune to see in his reign "plus grands, subtils et sçavans personnages, que durant celuy du roy son père."<sup>6</sup> Scholars like Ramus, Tournèbe, and Daurat found welcome at the court of Henri II. Brantôme then pays homage to Ronsard, his favorite among the poets of the Renaissance:

Et pour venir à nos poëtes françois, quel homme a esté M. Ronsard! Il a esté tel, que tous les autres poëtes qui sont venus après luy, ny qui viendront, se peuvent dire ses enfans et luy leur père; car il les a tous engendrez. C'est luy qui a deffaict la poësie laide, grossière, fade, sotte, mal limée, qui estoit auparadvant, et a faict ceste tant bien parée que nous

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 241.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 93-94.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 285-6.

voyons aujourd'hui; car il la para de graves et hautes sentences, luy donnant des motz nouveaux; et la rabilla des vieux bien reparez et renouvellez, comme fait un frippier d'une vieille robe.<sup>7</sup>

Brantôme reveals considerable acuteness as a literary critic in his estimate of Ronsard, whose high position given him by Brantôme has been confirmed by criticism of later centuries. Brantôme goes on to mention other members of the *Pléiade* and its satellites that were kindly treated by Henri II—men like Du Bellay, Baïf, Bel-leau, Jodelle, and Olivier de Magny, among others. He then comes back to his favorite, Ronsard, and relates the story of how he (Brantôme) was looking through the shop of a Venitian *imprimeur* for a volume of Petrarch. The printer suggested that it was a foolish search, since in France there existed a poet “plus excellent deux fois” than Petrarch, namely, M. de Ronsard.<sup>8</sup> Brantôme agrees, naturally, with this admiration for Ronsard and his group, “car ces poëtes ont esté bien autres qu'un Marot, un Salel, et un Sainct-Gelays, encor que M. de Sainct-Gelays fust un gentil poëte de son temps, et qu'il ne tinst rien de la barbare et antique poësie.”<sup>9</sup> Brantôme does not, even as Boileau in a later century, put Marot's generation on too high a peak. The King, according to Brantôme, liked all of the contemporaries of Ronsard, but Ronsard was “sa nourriture.” Royal generosity gave Jodelle five hundred *écus* for *Cléopâtre*, since the tragedy was a thing “nouvelle et très belle et rare, certes.” In brief, says Brantôme, Henri II, “encor qu'il ne fust lettré comme le roy son père, il ayma fort les lettres et gens sçavans.”<sup>10</sup>

With Charles IX, it was a different matter. When the weather was not suitable for outdoor relaxation, he assembled the poets in his *cabinet* and listened to their compositions. Otherwise, the King preferred some kind of athletic activity. According to Brantôme, among the poets preferred by Charles were Ronsard, Daurat, and Baïf; however, these were not too well recompensed, for poets, like horses, are not at their best if they are fat and surfeited with food and drink:

Entre les poëtes qu'il aymoit le plus, estoient MM. de Ronsard, Dorat (Daurat) et Baif, lesquels il vouloit tousjours qu'ils composassent quelque chose; et, quand ils la luy apportoient, il se plaisoit fort à la lire ou se la faire lire, et les en recompensoit, non pas tout à coup, mais peu à peu,

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 287.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 288.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 289.

afin qu'ilz fussent contrainetz tousjours de bien faire, disant: que les poëtes ressembloient les chevaux, qu'il falloit nourrir et non par trop saouler ny engraisser, car amprès ilz ne valent plus.<sup>10</sup>

Brantôme scatters through his lengthy chronicle many other evidences of his interest in literary happenings around the court. He mentions at least twice Mellin de Saint-Gelais' tragedy, *Sophonisbe*.<sup>11</sup> The play is brought up first in connection with a dramatic performance staged by the Cardinal of Ferrara for the *entrée* of Henry II and Catherine de Médicis into the city of Lyon in 1548. In the Cardinal's offering was Trissino's *Sofonisba* (in Italian). Brantôme thinks that Saint-Gelais' version of the play, performed at Blois in 1559, was better because it was better ornamented. Reference is made again to Saint-Gelais' *Sophonisbe* when Brantôme is discussing Catherine de Médicis' fondness for dances, ballets, tragedies and comedies. However, after *Sophonisbe* at Blois, "très bien representée par mesdames ses filles et autres dames et damoiselles, et gentilzhommes de sa court," Catherine had no more tragedies performed because she thought they brought bad luck. The Queen liked *gens scavans*, though, and read their compositions even when they were *belles invectives* against her.<sup>12</sup>

Ronsard appears again and again in Brantôme's colorful stories. La Reine d'Ecosse was admired by Ronsard and some of his poems are dedicated to her.<sup>13</sup> Ronsard wrote an elegy to Marguerite de Valois, the first wife of Henry IV, in his *Bocage royal*.<sup>14</sup> Ronsard wrote a sonnet (the third of the second book of the *Sonnets pour Hélène*) to Marguerite de Valois, in which he emphasized the contrasting colors in her face—a point suggested to Ronsard by Brantôme himself.<sup>15</sup> Ronsard, Baïf, and Desportes talk about the vengeance of love.<sup>16</sup> Ronsard is compared with Ovid<sup>17</sup>—and these are by no means all the references to Ronsard.

Throughout Brantôme's work are clear admiration and respect for the person who is gifted in foreign languages. He likes a man who can write in Latin and Greek, as witnessed in an earlier reference to Strozzi's translation of Caesar, and who is proficient in the

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 282.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 257 and VII, 346. Saint-Gelais' play was a translation of the Italian tragedy of Trissino, which dates from 1515.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 373.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 24.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 113.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 406.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 34.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 376.

more modern tongues. Catherine de Médicis, for example, spoke *fort bien françois*, though she was Italian.<sup>18</sup> Lucretia Borgia, in Brantôme's estimate one of the most accomplished princesses in all Christendom, "parloit force belles langues."<sup>19</sup> Brantôme himself inserts an occasional phrase of Latin, Greek, or Spanish in his chronicle, with almost a prideful air.

Brantôme concludes his portrait of M. Parisot, *grand maistre de Malte*, with a tribute to his linguistic ability as well as to his valor in arms:

Pour finir, je dis avec tout un monde; que M. le grand maistre Parisot a esté très grand capitaine; il en avoit toutes les qualitez. Outre sa vailance et capacité, il estoit un très bel homme, grand, de haute taille, de très belle apparence et belle façon, point esmeue, parlant très bien en plusieurs langues, comme bon françois, italien, espaignol, grec, arabe et ture, qu'il avoit apprises tant esclave parmy les Turcz qu'ailleurs. Je l'ai veu parler toutes ces langues sans aucun truchementz.<sup>20</sup>

You can judge, says Brantôme, how effective Parisot was in any council anywhere, since he could talk without an interpreter.

All ambassadors and persons in high state positions should, in the opinion of Brantôme, know several languages. Otherwise, they will appear ridiculous in any sort of international conference, and will show themselves to be "de grands veaux, qui ne sçavent et ne parlent que leur langue de veau."<sup>21</sup> He recalls a "certain evesque de France" who went to the Council of Trent "sans argent et sans latin" and came back the same way. Also, he knew a "certain ambassadeur françois" who spent six years in Spain and came back speaking Spanish just as badly as when he left. M. de Lansac, Brantôme remarks, said an ambassador should know well Spanish, Latin, French, and Italian. The other languages—Brantôme does not say what they are—are so difficult that it is *excusable* not to be proficient in them. Francis I and Charles V, both of whom knew a lot of languages, used only French and Spanish on state occasions, as did Marguerite de Navarre, who in foreign languages "sçavait plus que son pain quotidien."<sup>22</sup> It is well for princes to know tongues other than their own so that they can use them out of *gentillesses*.

As for persons in lower positions, Brantôme thinks it is certainly

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 373.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 239.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 75.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 256.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 73.

worth while for them to perfect themselves in a foreign tongue, and learn really to speak it well:

Nous autres petits compagnons, si nous savons ces langues, il est très bon que nous les parlions et les pratiquions; mais il les faut savoir parfaitement pour ne nous faire moquer si nous y faillons: aussy si nous nous en savons acquitter très-bien, nous nous en rendrons bien plus aimés, honnorés et estimés, tant à l'endroict des plus petits qu'à l'endroict des grands; ainsy que m'arriva une fois parlant au roy d'Espagne, qui fit plus d'estime de moy qu'il n'eust fait quand il m'entendit parler sa langue, ainsy que j'ay dict ailleurs (comme de vray, pour lors je la parlois très bien) et s'en estonna, et m'en fit très bonne chère. Il faut que je me vante de cela en passant.<sup>22</sup>

With this modest statement about how well he was received by the King of Spain because of his perfect Spanish, Brantôme concludes his rather long passage on the desirability of knowing foreign languages.

Not all the critical and linguistic comments made by Brantôme in his rambling chronicle have been disentangled. However, these should be enough to show that in the midst of a lot of scandalous yarns Brantôme has buried some sound bits of literary and linguistic criticism.

W. L. WILEY

*The University of North Carolina*

### FLAUBERT, PLAGIARIST OF CHATEAUBRIAND

Flaubert's devotion to the writings of Chateaubriand was life-long; the earlier man's influence is obvious to any reader of *Madame Bovary*, *Salammbô* or Flaubert's *Œuvres de jeunesse*. But it has not been realized that Flaubert at the ripe age of fourteen paid Chateaubriand the supreme compliment that one author can offer to another: he plagiarized him in a school-boy exercise, *la Mort du duc de Guise*, dated September, 1835.<sup>1</sup> And he also had the supreme school-boy success in this sort of endeavor: he has remained undetected, so far as I know, for one hundred and fifteen years.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, VII, 76.

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres de jeunesse*, Paris, Conard, 1910, I, 33-39.

On August 14, 1835, Flaubert wrote to his friend Ernest Chevalier that Gourgaud, a professor at the lycée de Rouen, was giving him "des narrations à composer." One can imagine so easily the situation by calling upon one's own school-day memories: an assignment to write a composition on an historical subject, a month has gone by, the time is growing short. The boy looks about for a topic and opens his copy of Chateaubriand to the *Analyse raisonnée de l'histoire de France*,<sup>2</sup> one of the lesser known works and thus a suitable source book for our culprit. His famous stock of well-sharpened pens is ready.

At the start, he makes an honest effort. He is going to take his basic thread from Chateaubriand; but, after all, historical material is anyone's property. He will work away from the original, striving for a result all his own. Chateaubriand had written:

Le 22, le duc de Guise, se mettant à table pour dîner, trouva sous sa serviette un billet ainsi conçu: "Donnez-vous de garde, on est sur le point de vous jouer un mauvais tour." Il écrivit au bas au crayon: on n'oserait; et il jeta le billet sous la table.

Flaubert pictures the scene and writes what he sees: the guests offer toasts, the room is full of the noise of clinking glasses, of voices sometimes muffled, sometimes raised in terrible oaths. Now he is ready for his initial incident and can draw quite directly on his source. But, with a fine feeling for the triviality of the pencil in Chateaubriand's version, he introduces the more noble dagger, an improvement which Dumas *père*—or Ducis—would have appreciated:

—Tiens, regarde ce billet et lis.

"Donnez-vous de garde; on est sur le point de vous jouer un mauvais tour." (*Historique.*)

—La plaisanterie est bonne! Un crayon que je répondre à ce Nostradamus de malheur, un crayon!

Personne n'en avait.

—Eh bien, Mandreville, donne-moi ton poignard.

Et le Balafré, après en avoir noirci la pointe à la lampe suspendue au milieu d'eux, écrivit: "On n'oserait," puis il jeta le billet sous la table.

Thus far Flaubert is carrying out admirably the intentions of his

<sup>2</sup> I shall cite from the edition Flaubert may well have used: the *Analyse* was first published in the *Œuvres complètes de . . . Chateaubriand*, Paris, Ladvocat, volume v ter. This volume appeared in 1831, only a few years before Flaubert made use of it. Our material is on pages 325 and 327-41.

instructor. But the temptation soon proves too much . . . it could hardly be otherwise. He moves his tale along, following the suggestions in his model. For the most part he is expanding; but now, from time to time, important sentences are so well phrased in the *Analyse raisonnée* that he does not even try to improve upon them. Chateaubriand had written of Henri III, shortly before the assassination of the duke:

Le roi se retira dans un appartement qui avoit vue sur les jardins, ayant tout ordonné avec le sang-froid d'un général qui va donner une bataille décisive; il ne s'agissoit que d'un assassinat et de la mort d'un homme; mais cet homme étoit le due de Guise.

Flaubert revises and expands; but he senses the value of the antithesis and the condensed power of the last statement. His artistic appreciation reinforces less noble feelings and he steals it, baldly:

Puis il rentra dans sa chambre. De toute la nuit il ne dormit pas, on eût dit qu'il s'agissait d'une bataille ou du sort de deux peuples. Oui, tout ce conseil, tous ces gardes, tous ces assassins, tous ces appareils de guerre ne devaient servir enfin qu'à la mort d'un seul homme; mais cet homme, c'était le due de Guise.

As his great heroines later on will discover, once you have started to sin, even a little, it is hard to put a stop to it. The youngster is getting tired now, and the fatal step has been taken. Whole sentences come tumbling onto his page, unchanged . . . and then he begins simply to copy the original, six full lines of it.<sup>3</sup>

But copying, too, grows tiresome. And perhaps it was getting really late. Necessity becomes the mother of virtue, and Flaubert returns to more honest practices, paraphrasing and condensing several pages of the *Analyse* into the last few lines of his story. One statement in the original, however, so delighted him that he could not resist retaining the thought in his version. Chateaubriand had written of the duke:

Un des assassins ne fit que le toucher et il tomba sur le lit du roi: jamais lit plus honteux ne vit mourir tant de gloire.

Flaubert keeps the antithesis and the key words though smothering them with his enthusiasm for the concept. It was to be his undoing:

<sup>3</sup> Bottom of page 38. Note, here and on the bottom of page 37, that the name *Saignac* reads *Loignac* in Chateaubriand. Error of Flaubert or of the editor in preparing Flaubert's manuscript for the printer?

Il fallait donc que ce lit si honteux, témoin des débauches des rois, vit mourir en un seul homme toute la gloire d'un siècle!

Ten more lines, and the paper was done, ready to be handed in on the following morning. Since he kept the paper, we may guess that his crime was undetected.

Five years elapsed; the incident was almost forgotten. Flaubert was off for the Pyrenees on a journey celebrating his attaining the baccalaureat, earned for the most part in more honorable fashion, we trust. The journey southward was somewhat hurried and he was unable to see all he had hoped to. We may let him tell the story:

Il ne faut rien moins que la vue de Blois pour faire penser à quelque chose de plus vigoureux et vous remettre en mémoire la cour d'Henri III. Hélas! je n'ai point vu le château où Henri se vengea de sa peur, ni ce lit, comme dit Chateaubriand, où tant d'ignominies firent mourir tant de gloire; la rapidité de ma course m'a à peine laissé la vue des murs extérieurs.<sup>4</sup>

Did his conscience twinge as he made this note in his diary? If so, it was only an advance warning, for it was in tracking down this reference that I came upon Chateaubriand's account of the *Mort du duc de Guise*.

B. F. BART

Pomona College

#### A LETTER FROM STÉPHANE MALLARMÉ

The following letter from Stéphane Mallarmé is now in the Houghton Library of Harvard University; I publish it with the kind permission of Mr. William A. Jackson, librarian in charge of the Houghton. The letter was written by Mallarmé to Mrs. Sarah Helen Whitman, who, it will be remembered, was Edgar Allan Poe's fiancée for a few stormy months late in 1848 and who later claimed to have been the subject of *Annabel Lee* as well as of certain other poems by her admirer. Mrs. Whitman, who was born in 1803 and who died in 1878, was herself a poetess of some small reputation in the middle years of the century but is now best remembered for her defence of the poet, *Edgar Allan Poe and His Critics*, and as the recipient of the letters which appeared some

<sup>4</sup> *Voyage aux Pyrénées*, printed after *Par les champs et par les grèves* in the Conard edition (1910). Cf. page 346.

thirty years after her death in the volume called *Last Letters of Edgar Allan Poe to Sarah Helen Whitman*.

At the time this letter of Mallarmé's was written, Mrs. Whitman was living in Providence, the place of her birth. She had evidently been in contact with Mallarmé through the agency of the 'Mr. Ingram' named in the letter; Mallarmé is doubtless referring to John H. Ingram, the English biographer of Poe who in 1880 published a two-volume study of the American poet, *Edgar Allan Poe, His Life, Letters and Opinions*.

The edition of *Le Corbeau* which Mallarmé says he is sending to Mrs. Whitman had been published by Richard Lesclide in Paris in 1875, with illustrations by Manet. The 'future work' mentioned by Mallarmé is a little difficult to identify, although it apparently was a work to be devoted to Poe, inasmuch as *Le Corbeau* had been designed to draw attention to it when it should appear. Mallarmé may be referring to a series of *Poèmes de Poe* which he published in 1876 in *La République des Lettres* and which were to form part of the volume entitled *Poèmes d'Edgar Poe* which he published at long last in 1888. However, it is also possible that he is referring to the *Poe Mémorial*, which appeared in 1877 and which contained, as Mallarmé's contribution, the sonnet which he entitled simply *Hommage V*, but which we now know as *Le Tombeau d'Edgar Poe*. No other publication of Mallarmé's in the years immediately following 1876 deals extensively with Poe, so it is perhaps safe to conclude that the 'future work' is either the series of *Poèmes de Poe* or the *Hommage V*.

87 Rue de Rome  
Paris April 4, 1876

Madame,

I do not know if this letter will precede or follow by a few days the arrival in Rhode Island of a copy of *Le Corbeau* that my *colaborateur* (*sic*) Manet and myself have felt it not less a duty than a pleasure to offer you. Whatever is done to honor the memory of a genius the most truly divine the world has seen, ought-it-not-at-first (*sic*) to obtain your sanction?

Such of Poe's works as our great Baudelaire has left untranslated, that is to say, the poems and many of the critical fragments, I hope to make known to France, and my first attempt of which you will receive (*sic*) a specimen, is intended to attract attention to a future work, now, nearly completed.

I trust that the attempt will meet your approval, but no possible success

## A LETTER FROM STÉPHANE MALLARMÉ 341

of my design in the future could cause you, Madame, a satisfaction<sup>1</sup> equal to the joy, vivid, profound and absolute—one of the best my literary life has yet procured for me—caused by a *feuillet*<sup>2</sup> kindly sent me by Mr. Ingram from one of your letters, in which you express a wish to see a copy of our *Corbeau*.

Not only in space, which is nothing, but in *time*, made up for each of us of the hours we deem most memorable in the past, your wish seemed to come to me from *so far!* and to bring with it the most delicious return of long-cherished memories: for, fascinated (*sic*) with the works of Poe from my infancy, it is already a very long time since your name became associated with his in my earliest and most intimate sympathies.

Receive, (*sic*) Madame, this expression of a gratitude such as your poetic soul may comprehend, for it is my inmost heart that thanks you.

Stéphane Mallarmé

ROBERT J. NIESS

*The University of Michigan*

---

### WHAT HAPPENED TO MAUPASSANT'S PLAY, *LA DEMANDE?*

In 1878, in a letter to Flaubert,<sup>1</sup> Maupassant states that he doesn't want to have his play, *La Demande*, recopied since it is legible despite the erasures. In Mr. Artinian's book, *Maupassant Criticism in France*,<sup>2</sup> there is mention that the play is lost. What has happened to *La Demande* might well remain a puzzle to the students of Maupassant.

A half century had passed after the writing of this lost play, when, in 1927, Pierre Borel published in the French journal *Le Temps*, February 24, a fragment of *La Demande* found among some papers of Maupassant.<sup>3</sup> This fragment shows a noticeable resemblance to another of Maupassant's plays, *La Paix du Ménage*,

<sup>1</sup> Mallarmé had originally written 'joy,' but had crossed it out and written 'satisfaction' immediately after it.

<sup>2</sup> The original word had been 'page,' but Mallarmé had again crossed it out and written 'feuillet' above it.

<sup>3</sup> *Chroniques, Etudes, et Correspondance de Maupassant*, Paris, Librairie Gründ, p. 246.

<sup>4</sup> Artinian, Artine, *Maupassant Criticism in France*, New York, King's Crown Press, 1941, p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Oeuvres Complètes de Maupassant*, Paris, Librairie de France, 1938, XIV, 528.

presented in 1893 at the Comédie Française under the direction of Alexandre Dumas *filis*.

It is the opinion of the present writer that *La Demande* was incorporated, partially at least, into *La Paix du Ménage*.

*La Demande* concerns a double triangle in Paris high society. M. Sallures has a mistress; his wife is going to have a lover. This same theme is found in *La Paix du Ménage*. A second similarity between the two plays is seen in the cast of characters. In *La Paix du Menage* M. and Mme de Sallus had at first been named de Sallures, and Jacques de Randol had been named Jacques de Randal, but, when Maupassant became ill and Dumas *filis* took over production of the play, the names were changed to their present spelling. In *Le Figaro*, March 7, 1893, one finds the following statement made by "un Monsieur de l'Orchestre" regarding the change of names:

On a dû cependant, pour faire droit à la réclamation d'un homonyme, substituer Randol à Randal, et, pour éviter un jeu de mots aussi malséant que facile, étant donnée la situation respective des deux époux, changer M. et Mme de Sallures en M. et Mme de Sallus.

Another obvious similarity lies in the dialogue itself. In the fragment of *La Demande* one can notice the likeness in speech to that of *La Paix du Ménage*.

*LA DEMANDE*

M. de Sallures

. . . Quelques hommes d'esprit et quelques jeunes femmes, et pas de foule.

Madame de Sallures

C'est impossible. On ne peut fermer sa porte.

Jacques de Randal

Oui, le monde aujourd'hui c'est la foule. C'est une coulée de gens à travers mille salons, dont toutes les ouvertures sont béantes.

*LA PAIX DU MENAGE*, scene 2, act II

M. de Sallus

—Quelques hommes d'esprit et quelques jolies femmes et pas de foule.

Madame de Sallus

C'est impossible. On ne peut pas fermer sa porte.

Jacques de Randol

Non, on ne peut pas, en effet, endiguer cette coulée de niais à travers les salons.

With these observations in mind, may one not conclude that *La Demande* was not necessarily lost, but was assimilated to some extent into a later work which became *La Paix du Ménage*? The absence of the manuscript itself may well be attributed to the probability that *La Demande* was the first draft for the idea of *La Paix du Ménage*, and, like many a writer's first draft, that it was neglected or discarded.

ALBERT R. HAMRA

*Columbia, Mo.*

---

### MORE ABOUT THE WORD ASSASSIN IN PROVENÇAL

In a recent article,<sup>1</sup> I examined five occurrences of the word *Assassin* (*assessi, ancessi*, etc.) that I had found in Old Provençal poetry,<sup>2</sup> and expressed the conviction that all five poems containing the word were written shortly after the year 1192. My reason was this: in that year, Philip Augustus circulated a rumor to the effect that the Old Man of the Mountain, at the request of Richard the Lion Heart, had sent some of his Assassins to murder him (Philip); this rumor was widely publicized in France, and caused considerable alarm. This fact could easily account for a sudden popularity of the name *Assassin*, which is not found in any French or Provençal work that is definitely dated before 1192.<sup>3</sup>

I have lately discovered another use of the word, likewise in Provençal, which supports that opinion. In the poem *Be'm platz quar tregua ni fis*,<sup>4</sup> Bertran de Born says that the lords in his

<sup>1</sup> "The Troubadours and the Assassins," in *Modern Language Notes*, April, 1949, pp. 245-251. At that time, I was unaware that Professor Kurt Lewent had published a note on the same subject in *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, XXXVIII, 31-33; the matter of dates, however, is not discussed there.

<sup>2</sup> Two in Aimeric de Peguilhan, one each in Giraut de Bornelh, Bernart de Bondeilhs, and an anonymous love-letter in verse.

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Professor Leo Spitzer for the information that *assassi* has been proposed as an emendation for a difficult passage in Jaufre Rudel's famous poem *Lanquan li jorn son lorc en mai*, composed around the middle of the twelfth century. But since this reading does not actually occur in the MSS, we can hardly use it as proof that the word *Assassin* is found in Provençal literature as early as Jaufre's time.

<sup>4</sup> Number 80,24 in Pillet-Carstens, *Bibliographie der Troubadours*, Halle, 1933; number 24 (p. 106) in *Bertran von Born*, herausgegeben von Albert Stimming, Halle, 1892.

neighborhood like to live in isolation, with few visitors (*aise ab pauc de companha*); he continues:

Sembla's guarden d'ansessis,  
Que ja lai on us d'els fos  
Non entreratz ses mesclanha.

"It seems that they are guarding themselves against Assassins, for you can never enter where they are without a struggle."

Stimming, the editor of *Bertran*, it is true, translates *ansessi* in his glossary as "Mörder." But I believe that my earlier article shows that the word inevitably referred at this time not to murderers in general, but specifically to the sect of Assassins.

The important fact about the poem for our present purpose is its date. It was written shortly before the return of King Richard from captivity in Germany, early in 1194, and surely belongs either to that year or to 1193.<sup>5</sup> Here, then, is definite proof that the word *Assassin* had a certain currency among the troubadours, at precisely the date I suggested for the other poems in which it is found. This leads me to feel, more strongly than ever, that the word was first popularized in western Europe by some idle talk of Philip Augustus. Before 1192, it was only a foreign name, known to historians (writing in Latin) and probably to a few Crusaders. After that year, it was well on the way toward becoming a part of everyday speech.

FRANK M. CHAMBERS

*Northwestern University*

---

"OR EST VENUZ QUI AUNERA" AND THE ENGLISH  
PROVERBIAL PHRASE "TO TAKE HIS  
MEASURE"

In commenting on the line "Or est venuz qui aunera" in Chrétien's *Charrette* William A. Nitze suggested that the poet referred to the measuring of the grave.<sup>1</sup> Could we not rather find here a reference to measuring a person for a grave as if measuring him for a suit of clothes and thus explain the English phrase "to

<sup>5</sup> See the introduction to Stimming's edition (note 4), pp. 39-40.

<sup>1</sup> "'Or est venuz qui aunera': a Medieval Dictum," *MLN.*, LVI (1941), 405-409.

take his measure"? The French parallels quoted by Professor Nitze lend themselves to this interpretation, as he points out to me. A late medieval English ballad of the Robin Hood cycle is entirely explicit:

The iustyce called to hym a ladde;  
Clowdysles clothes sholde he haue,  
To take the mesure of that good yoman,  
And thereafter to make hys graue.<sup>2</sup>

As Bartlett Jere Whiting tells me, this allusion is somewhat unusual, since the traditional size of a grave is likely to be either "long and deep" or six feet. Certainly "to take his measure" means to lay him out on the ground so that you can pace him off. The modern colloquial uses of the phrase in the meanings "to fall," "to scrutinize," and "to knock down" can all have arisen from the idea of measuring a person who lies stretched out on the ground.<sup>3</sup>

ARCHER TAYLOR

*University of California, Berkeley*

---

### THE SICK TUNE

In *Much Ado About Nothing* (III, iv, 41) Hero asks Beatrice, "Why, how now? Do you speak in the sick tune?" Beatrice replies, "I am out of all other tune, methinks." And Margaret adds, "Clap 's into 'Light o' Love'; that goes without a burden." The commentators generally explain "Light o' Love" as a well-known ditty, and the Furness Variorum edition gives music and words. But most of the editions of the play offer no explanation of the words "sick tune" and print the words without capitals or quotation marks. Three editors do offer explanations. G. B.

<sup>2</sup> "Adam Bel, Clym of the Cloughe, and Wyllyam of Cloudesle," ll. 283-284 in W. C. Hazlitt, *Remains of the Early Popular poetry of England* (London, 1866), II, 150 and Francis James Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, III (Boston, 1888), 25 stanza 71.

<sup>3</sup> See L. V. Berrey and M. van den Bark, *The American Thesaurus of Slang* (New York, 1942), pp. 60, No. 4 (fall), 137, No. 9 (scrutinize), 702, No. 16 (knock down). See also (p. 117, No. 15) "to be measured for a new overcoat,—a wooden kimona or overcoat," which is equivalent to "to be buried."

Harrison<sup>1</sup> explains the line, "i. e., as if you were unwell." George Lyman Kittredge<sup>2</sup> gives a similar explanation: "Hero has answered in a melancholy tone, for she has a presentiment of ill fortune." Tucker Brooke<sup>3</sup> annotates the line: "tone of an invalid." Such, no doubt, is the meaning. But the whole passage is full of puns, and there is one more pun in the reference to the sick tune, for "The Sick Tune" was probably as well known to an Elizabethan audience as was "Light o' Love."

Both tunes were transcribed by the late Arnold Dolmetsch, formerly of Haslemere, England, for recorders. Through correspondence with the Dolmetsch family, I learn that they are aware of the reference in *Much Ado*, and Mrs. Arnold Dolmetsch has supplied the following words "as taken from the MS Vespasian A/25 in the Cotton Library."

Captain Carr

It befell at Martin Mass,  
When the weather waxed cold,  
Captain Carr said to his men,  
We must go and take a hold.  
  
Sick, Ah Sick and Very Sick,  
And Sick and Like to Die,  
The sickest night that I abode,  
Good Lord, Have Mercy on me.

These lines are from "Captain Car, or, Edom O Gordon," which is printed in full as Number 178 in *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*.<sup>4</sup> In Child's edition the second quatrain is printed as chorus or burden. Child's probably more accurate transcription of the burden is as follows:

Syck, sike, and to-tow sike,  
And sike and like to die;  
The sikkest nighte that euer I abode,  
God lord haue mercy on me!

According to Child's head-note on this ballad, the historical

<sup>1</sup> G. B. Harrison, *Shakespeare 23 Plays*, New York, 1948, *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> G. L. Kittredge, *Sixteen Plays of Shakespeare*, Boston, 1946, *ad loc.*

<sup>3</sup> Tucker Brooke, *Much Ado About Nothing* (Yale Shakespeare) New Haven, 1917, *ad loc.*

<sup>4</sup> Sargent and Kittredge, eds., *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, New York, 1904, p. 434.

episode upon which it was based occurred in 1571, and the manuscript is "of the last quarter of the 16th century."<sup>5</sup> "Light o' Love" is dated about 1570.<sup>6</sup> Thus the tunes are almost exactly contemporary. The fact that "The Sick Tune" has a burden gives point to Margaret's remark that "Light of Love" goes *without* a burden.

A. P. TAYLOR

*Chico State College*

---

EDOUARD ESTAUNIÉ IN THE *COLUMBIA DICTIONARY OF MODERN EUROPEAN LITERATURE*

Some of the data on Edouard Estaunié given by Albert Schinz in the *Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature* (p. 252) stand in need of correction. Estaunié died in 1942 (April 2),<sup>1</sup> not in 1943. Although widely given as 1892, the correct date of *Bonne-Dame* is 1891. If there exists a collection of short narratives to which the story *L'Infirmé aux mains de lumière* gave its title, it has escaped the attention of all bibliographers. In the account of the exchange of letters between Maupassant and Estaunié occasioned by the latter's fear that his first novel would be thought a plagiarism of *Pierre et Jean*, it is said in the *Dictionary* that Maupassant's novel and *Un Simple* were "published within a few weeks of each other," although the correct date of *Un Simple* (1891)<sup>2</sup> is given. Maupassant's famous preface is dated 1887, and his letter,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> H. H. Furness, ed., *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Much Adoe About Nothing*, Second Edition, Philadelphia, 1899, p. 181.

<sup>3</sup> *New York Times* for April 4, 1942. Also the records of the *Société des Gens de Lettres*: "décédé le 2 avril 1942 à Paris, 41 rue Raffet—Obsèques le 4 avril à 14 H. dans la plus stricte intimité." M. H. Ilsley (*F. R.*, 1943, p. 462) gives the date as April 15, 1942.

<sup>4</sup> Incorrectly dated 1888 by Daniel-Rops (*Edouard Estaunié*, Alcan, 1931) and Ruth C. Hok (*Edouard Estaunié*, King's Crown, 1949). In *Regards sur l'œuvre d'Edouard Estaunié* (Perrin, 1935), Camille Cé, who received much of his information from Estaunié, has the author writing for the *Gazette Diplomatique* in 1892 and, after the suspension of this paper, going to the publisher Perrin with the manuscript of *Un Simple*. Estaunié stopped writing for the *Gazette* in 1889. A curious slip, for Cé elsewhere dates the novel correctly.

<sup>5</sup> It may be read in René Dumesnil's *Chroniques, études, correspondance de Guy de Maupassant* (Grund, 1938), and in Cé (*op. cit.*), and has been quoted, in translation, by Francis Steegmuller (*Maupassant*, Random House, 1949) as a rare instance of Maupassant's generosity to a colleague. The correct version of this episode was published by Clément-Janin (*Monde Nouveau*, July 15, 1924), who asserts that Maupassant authorized (through

graciously assuring Estaunié that there could be no question of plagiarism, was sent from his yacht at Cannes on the second of February, 1888. *Pierre et Jean* appeared very early in 1888. While it is true, as is said at the end of the account, that Estaunié dedicated "a later book to Maupassant," it would have been more pertinent to note that *Un Simple* was so dedicated. Finally, to say that the two novels have "exactly" the same subject is putting it rather strongly.<sup>4</sup> They differ from each other almost as each differs from *Hamlet*, which has a similar subject, a son tortured by his mother's adultery.

EDWARD HARVEY

Kenyon College

## REVIEWS

*Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter.* Von ERNST ROBERT CURTIUS. Bern: A. Francke A G Verlag, 1948. Pp. 601.

This book presents mediaeval literature as the link ("die verwitterte Römerstrasse") between antiquity and modern civilization. It is not a chronological history of literature: the enormous material, collected over 15 years, ranging from early Greek to 20th Century texts, has been subjected to a process of fusion and reintegration, and is presented according to problems and approaches which the author, by his investigations, has found essential. There can hardly be any single scholar capable of reporting on all parts of the book with equal competence; reading it, most of us, I daresay all of us, may feel ourselves either as specialists or as dilettantes, and a good deal of time may be needed in order to assimilate and fully utilize all the suggestions and discoveries which it contains. It is well known that Mr. Curtius represents a unique combination of scholarship and modern literary background, of largeness of horizon and philological accuracy, of commonsense and refinement; it may be added that this work, planned and executed in Germany, roughly between 1932 and 1947, is a monument of powerful, passionate and obstinate energy.

a mutual friend, according to Steegmuller) Estaunié to use his letter as a preface to *Un Simple*. It is considered a mark of Estaunié's independence that he did not avail himself of the opportunity to launch his novel with a Maupassant preface.

<sup>4</sup> For Antoine Albalat (*Trente ans de quartier latin*, Malfière, 1930, p. 90) the novels had "exactement . . . le même sujet, presque le même plan." Albalat ended his melodramatic account: "Sa déception fut cruelle. . . . Estaunié brula (*sic!*) son manuscrit."

The difficulties of giving a short and adequate description of the work are increased by the fact that the attempt to integrate the material according to great problems, although few others would be able to carry it so far as Mr. Curtius did, has not been entirely successful. The organization of the book, in spite of the author's own explanations (pp. 233, 385), is not always easy to understand. The dominating method is "topology," i. e. the investigation of traditional devices (*topoi*), patterns of style as well as motives of contents, throughout the whole history of European literature, especially in late antiquity and the Middle Ages. Seven of the eighteen chapters and several of the 25 "Exkurse" are entirely devoted to such *topoi*; topology plays an important part in the other chapters as well. The material collected is not only admirable by its choice and overwhelming abundance, not only extremely suggestive as a model for further research, but very often delightful in itself. But it is too much. The material sometimes interrupts or blurs the leading ideas, and some of these, scattered over different chapters, are not presented with the strength and consistency they deserve. Moreover, the profusion of topology, together with the sagacious but somewhat one-sided criticism of "*Geistesgeschichte*" may easily lead critics to consider the book as merely "positivistic" and lacking in historical insight. That would be utterly unjustified. It is inspired by synthetic ideas—ideas which are, indeed, mostly (but not exclusively) based rather on a rational and as it were strategical vision than on insight into the living individual phenomenon. Still, if one collected the scattered observations on individual phenomena (e. g. on St. Jerome, Calderón, Gracián, Hofmannsthal), it would be sufficient for several studies in "*Geistesgeschichte*".

Among the leading ideas, there is first of all the radical rejection of all national or chronological isolation within European civilization, and the establishment of "European Literature as the intelligible field of study" for historians of literature. Closely linked with this program is the conception of European literature as a unity based on the Latin tradition—a tradition which has never been interrupted, if not in the last two centuries. Curtius' main task consists in demonstrating the continuity of his tradition from late antiquity to the Carolingian era, and from there to the 12th and 13th Centuries. He performs this by a history of the *artes liberales*, of rhetoric and the conceptions of poetry, and of numerous *topoi*. The struggles and fusions of pagan and Christian tradition, and the conflicting conceptions of the dignity of poetry are the main themes of this history. Especially the last theme, the conflict of the concept of philosophical or theological poetry with the dialectic and scholastic, i. e. scientific attitude, despising poetry and the *artes*, is an important motive of the book; a theme which shows Dante's *Commedia* in a largely antithomistic light, and as an ultimate result of a tradition represented in the high Middle Ages by men

such as Bernardus Silvestris and Alanus de Insulis. Although I am not quite convinced that this theme deserves as much importance as Curtius attributes to it (this is not a disapproval, but a suspension of judgment), it is certainly extremely suggestive and original; I should have wished it to be presented without interruption and interference of other material, as the center of the whole investigation.

If the work has lost something of its potential unity by its abundance of material and of minor suggestions and discoveries, it has certainly gained in usefulness as a repertoire and as a model of philological research. It contains a history of the *artes* from Seneca to the 13th Century (chapter 3); a thorough historical analysis of poetry as rhetoric and of the system of mediaeval styles (chapters 4 and 8); a history of the formation of "canons" of model authors (chapter 14); a history of mannerism which (although still incomplete) establishes mannerism as a continuous tendency, not as a particularity of the so-called literary baroque (chapter 15); and among the *topos* collections, there are delightful and important things such as the *locus amoenus* (chapter 10), the Muses (chapter 13), and the book as symbol (chapter 16). There is a wonderful passage on method (pp. 386-387), and there are treasures in the 25 "Exkurse" (e. g. on late antique and mediaeval literary scholarship, on Etymology as a form of thinking, on Spanish aesthetics in the *siglo de oro*, on Diderot).

All this is *pauca e multis* (a *topos*) I hope I shall have another occasion to deal at length with several aspects of the book. Some facts which have struck me may be mentioned here. Among the *topoi*, the oxymoron (especially the paradoxical oxymoron), although occasionally referred to, is rather neglected; yet it seems to me one of the most significant facts ("*bedeutsame Tatsachen*") in the fusion of pagan rhetoric and Christian conceptions—and of the history of European poetical patterns, centered on Petrarch who is also somewhat neglected. Secondly, Curtius has several times to deal with allegory. It seems that, for him, allegory is a concept needing no further analysis. Yet there is some difference between the typology used by St. Augustin and St. Bernard, and the allegories of Martianus Capella or Alanus de Insulis. Typology, too, seems to me one of the most "*bedeutsame Tatsachen*" in mediaeval civilization. I combine these two points apparently not connected with each other, because they both show that Curtius is less interested in certain basically Christian phenomena than in the continuity of classical patterns. The Bible interests him so far as it is supposed, by St. Jerome and Cassiodorus, to be the model of pagan rhetorics, and the Fathers of the Church in so far as they are philologists. Furthermore, he has an almost exclusively aesthetic and literary approach to the Middle Ages—and he neglects, and sometimes seems to underestimate, its popular trends. Thus, this magnificent book, a model of modern combinative and perspective

scholarship, yet presents a somewhat incomplete and one-sided picture of the European Middle Ages.<sup>1</sup>

ERICH AUERBACH

*Institute for Advanced Study,  
Princeton, New Jersey*

---

*Hawthorne's Last Phase.* By EDWARD HUTCHINS DAVIDSON. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949. (*Yale Studies in English*. Volume III). Pp. xviii + 172. \$3.75.

Mr. Davidson's study is another of that series of biographical reconsiderations of Hawthorne issuing from recent work on the Hawthorne manuscripts. True enough, emphasis in *Hawthorne's Last Phase* is not so much on life as on letters; yet letters are studied mainly as they reflect life and the process of authorship. What results, in the words of Mr. Davidson's preface, is a study of Hawthorne's "craftsmanship" which is pointed towards "general conclusions on Hawthorne's art-method"—in "the novels of the major as well as of the last phase"; what results is biography which is pointed towards critical analysis. And in the end Mr. Davidson is the victim in critical analysis of his own precision in biography and its handmaiden bibliography.

The greater part of *Hawthorne's Last Phase*—four out of six chapters, an appendix, and a bibliography—is taken up with transcriptions and analyses of the literary remains of Hawthorne's last years—his manuscript notes, sketches, scenarios, and preliminary drafts for "The Ancestral Footstep," "Dr. Grimshawe's Secret," "Septimus Felton," and "The Dolliver Romance." These are given their proper setting in an introductory chapter sketching Hawthorne's life from 1858 to 1864 and are evaluated in a concluding critical study of the relevance of Hawthorne's failure in them to his success in the great romances and tales of the major phase, *The Scarlet Letter* and the rest. Attention centers primarily on the fragments and what they tell us about craftsmanship. So Mr. Davidson transcribes most of Hawthorne's last notes and sketches, arranges them chronologically, compares one with another, relates one group to another, and tracks down, whenever he can, sources in the *Notebooks* and in what we know of Hawthorne's life. All this is exciting and important. And we are grateful—in that special way we are grateful to anyone who tells us an awful truth—to be able at last clearly to see Hawthorne's final struggles to find idea, symbol, and plot and so to make just one more romance. Hawthorne, as the manuscripts and Mr. Davidson's commentary

<sup>1</sup> An English translation in the Bollingen Series is being prepared.

show, felt that he must see moral patterns everywhere; the problem was to invent palpable conditions of existence which in themselves would be shaped by those patterns and which might be the means of communicating them to a reader. We see Hawthorne struggling within himself, turning to his notebooks and to his memories, failing to find anything commensurate with his artistic needs, and virtually cursing himself for his failure. In what Mr. Davidson labels Study D of "The Dolliver Romance," Hawthorne wrote the epitaph for these remains: "There is need of some great central event." (p. 130.) In his last years he could not find greatness and centrality in himself, his memories, or his surroundings. The record is of a broken man's tired confusion.

The biographical relevance of this much of *Hawthorne's Last Phase* is, as all such relevance should be, self-evident and self-sustaining. We come to know, simply and profoundly enough, what Hawthorne did and did not do, how he worked, in these last years. The critical, literary relevance is yet another matter. When Mr. Davidson tries, in his final chapter, to relate Hawthorne's failure in these last fictions to his success in *The Scarlet Letter* and the rest, literary biography—here especially the study of the process of authorship—moves into and so vitiates literary criticism.

Bypassing Hawthorne's own discussion of the nature of the romance and the romancer, Mr. Davidson classifies him as a special kind of allegorical romancer: "As an allegorist, he was primarily concerned with morals—the operations of laws of right and wrong in the world; and as a romancer he merged the moral with the strange, crepuscular world which was not of this daily earth but of his own strange imagination." (pp. 142-143). For Mr. Davidson, Hawthorne thus, by definition, exhibits a compulsive need to find the symbolic means whereby such a merging might be managed; and in his last fictions we see him working at this and failing utterly. We must remark the logic here: For Mr. Davidson, seeing what Hawthorne's fictions don't come to in his last phase is explicitly a means of seeing what they do come to in his major phase. What does this later failure tell us about Hawthorne as an artist, about Hawthorne's masterworks? Mr. Davidson ventures to suggest, primarily from the evidence of the last phase, that Hawthorne "was not personally interested in the operation of moral laws" yet that he "was passionately concerned with [moral laws] as an artist." (p. 143, italics Mr. Davidson's.) He worked regularly from a "moral law" to a "romantic image or episode." It follows in this account that the center of Hawthorne's real interest was the episode, the romance—not, as we had generally believed, the moral law. And Mr. Davidson, shifting once more from the last to the major phase, can find evidence for such a conclusion in the fact that even the great romances are concerned with what he ventures to call, on what basis he does not specify, "trivial moral laws." So one is not surprised that Mr. Davidson, early in the genesis of this

argument, is constrained to observe of *The Marble Faun*, for example, that it "treats the least serious of any of Hawthorne's moral truths: the effects of sin on a primitive, unblemished innocence." (p. 143.) Taken out of artistic context and studied as biographical epiphenomena, Hawthorne's moralizing is thus reduced to a nervous habit and his concept of original sin to a species of pseudo-statement. The work of the artist who succeeded is lost in the life of the artist who failed.

Here, I submit, is the critical weakness of the last part of Mr. Davidson's study. Because he argues from biography to criticism, he is forced to interpret artistic success in terms of personal failure, an integral literary whole in terms of disintegrated literary and autobiographical fragments. He cannot look at the major fictions in and of themselves. A certain confusion results: Mr. Davidson's *Marble Faun*—with its trivial morality—cannot be recognized as ours; nor can his *Scarlet Letter* nor his *House of the Seven Gables*. Certainly we might grant that Hawthorne failed late in his life because he could not find the concretely objective terms in which moral truth might be shown operating in his world. We have the fragmented failures to tell us just that; Mr. Davidson makes those failures tell us just that. But it would not seem necessarily to follow that Hawthorne had earlier succeeded in precisely the same way that he later failed, that *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Marble Faun* are not serious expressions of serious moral laws taken seriously, that moral triviality is the only possible antecedent to moral confusion, and that the books produced by a fresh Hawthorne who could write are the same as books by a tired Hawthorne who could not. It would not seem necessarily to follow, in short, that what Hawthorne's great fictions say is what Hawthorne himself was. Yet Mr. Davidson's critical procedure and his exigeses can issue only from just such an assumption. The logic is bad, but it is there. And in order at once to hold on to a morally serious *Scarlet Letter* and *Marble Faun* and to accept Mr. Davidson's excellent portrait of the later Hawthorne, we are forced, I suggest, to proceed from an assumption exactly the opposite from his. We must assume that a perfected book is to be distinguished, above all, from the process of perfecting it and from the personality of its perfector in any of his phases. Somehow Mr. Davidson's biographical expertness would force him to blur all such distinctions.

The criticism in *Hawthorne's Last Phase* is inadequate, then, simply because it is not criticism independent enough to stand by itself in the presence of the master-works on which it is to be operative. What is left is expert biography and bibliography. In point of fact, what Mr. Davidson's first five chapters give us is precise insight into the fate of the writer in nineteenth-century America. This is to say he furnishes abundant data for our cultural history. But even such history, and the personal records which go partially to make it up, is not to be confused with the

work of literature, no matter how relevant it may be to that work. Here I would venture to point a moral—a moral all the more meaningful because it rises out of consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of a book as expert and as ambitious as Mr. Davidson's: If our understanding of Hawthorne's career and its cultural significance is gradually being deepened by studies like *Hawthorne's Last Phase*, we yet have need for an historical criticism adequate to the task of understanding Hawthorne's art.

ROY HARVEY PEARCE

*Ohio State University*

---

*Essays and Sketches*, being volumes IV-VI of *The Works of John Henry Newman*. Edited by C. F. HARROLD. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1948.

*Sermons and Discourses*, being volumes VII-VIII of *The Works of John Henry Newman*. Edited by C. F. HARROLD. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1949.

The three volumes of Newman's *Works* which the late Professor Harrold calls *Essays and Sketches* are a selection from the six volumes of essays which Newman collected and published as *Essays Critical and Historical*, *Historical Sketches*, and *Discussions and Arguments*. Professor Harrold might have adhered to Newman's own principle and made each of his volumes a selection, respectively, from essays of a critical character (literary and theological), those more definitely historical (the rise of the universities and the lives of saints), and the more journalistic pieces, mostly written for newspapers, which comprised the *Discussions and Arguments*. But this arrangement has been discarded for one that is strictly chronological, so that each volume includes materials from at least two of Newman's collections. This new arrangement has the great advantage of enabling the reader to follow Newman's changing interests and developing thought throughout most of his literary life, from the article on Cicero in 1824 to the review of Seeley's *Ecce Homo* in 1866.

On the other hand, this present edition, compared with the original volumes, has one great disadvantage: it contains only about two-thirds of Newman's work in this kind, and no more is to be published. Given the hard condition of having to omit so much material, Professor Harrold has probably made as wise a choice as could be hoped. But as always, in such cases, there will be differences of opinion. He himself was bothered by the omission of over half of the chapters on the *Rise and Progress of Universities*, and offers rather an apology than a defence. Other scholars will wonder

why he omitted—and without a word of explanation—the illuminating essays on two fellows of Oriel College who had a notable influence on Newman's mind, John Davison and John Keble. Indeed, when we remember the enormous importance of the latter in Newman's life and thought, it seems almost incredible that the essay of 1846 should not appear in a twenty-volume edition of the *Works*.

Professor Harrold's introductions show his usual skill in presenting the general reader with the essential information he needs. For each essay some account of the subject matter is combined with an indication of its place in Newman's work and a few words of evaluation. There is not space, apparently, for the kind of critical re-examination which the Newman scholar would like to have had from so eminent an authority.

When we consider the *Sermons and Discourses* from the same angles—arrangement, selection, and introductions—we come to almost the opposite conclusions. Here the chronological arrangement is not only less meaningful (the date of many sermons is immaterial, and Professor Harrold notices in particular how removed from Newman's life and thought at the time are the Parochial sermons of 1839-1842), but it is actually, in one respect, detrimental. The volume of *Oxford University Sermons* is a connected discussion of the relationship between reason and faith, and sufficiently cohesive to be considered a trial sketch for the later *Grammar of Assent*, but it inevitably loses all of its identity as soon as its parts are broken up and the sermons separately placed according to the accident of date. A better plan, I think, would have been to group together the selections from each of Newman's collections, and then arrange the groups in rough chronological order, starting with the *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, continuing with *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day* and the *Oxford University Sermons*, and ending with the Roman Catholic work in *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions and Discourses to Mixed Congregations*.

Out of Newman's 256 sermons, these volumes contain only 52, but in this case the selection seems to me safe from any serious objection. The editor has succeeded in representing the full range of Newman's best work in this kind, from his early Calvinist and mystical sermons, through the High Anglican sermons of 1838 and the following years, to the more expansive preaching of the Roman convert.

The prefatory essays to these volumes, however, are less satisfactory. It was a mistake, I think, to write two introductions, one for each volume. A single introduction, prefixed to the first volume, could have dealt with Newman's sermons in a complete and rounded essay, and thus avoided the hard task of "starting in all over again," with its evidence of effort and its tendency to repetition. Moreover, although his defence of reading sermons today and the analysis of Newman's great powers as a preacher are adequate,

Professor Harrold was not at his best in the field of criticism. He was a historian of literature and scholarship, and in that area his wide learning and excellent judgment produced work of real distinction.

WALTER E. HOUGHTON

Wellesley College

---

*Alfred Tennyson.* By CHARLES TENNYSON. New York: Macmillan, 1949. Pp. xv, 579. Illus. \$7.50.

Writing in 1940 on "Recent Trends in Victorian Studies," C. F. Harrold remarked "the curious neglect, among scholars, of the problems of Tennyson." If all the data relevant to Tennysonian problems had been available and had been neglected by scholars, the observation would be a disturbing one; but actually this seeming neglect is but an impression left by the best of the twentieth century's grist of Tennyson books: those by Lounsbury, Scaife, Wolfe, Nicolson, Fausset, and (in 1948) P. F. Baum. For all the special insights which these display, none can rise above the limitations imposed by their few common sources: the *Memoir* by the second Baron, and a small handful of similar material. The portrait of Tennyson has remained unclear because it has been painted too much from memory, at second hand, from an indistinct original. Here and there, in the 1940's, new studies have attempted with success to push back the narrow boundaries which have hitherto hedged investigators; but important sources of information, locked from the world by Tennyson's excessive respect for his own privacy, were unavailable.

These have now been carefully combed and admirably digested by the poet's grandson, Sir Charles Tennyson, nephew of the second Baron. Sir Charles closes his new biography by hailing a contemporary "return to Tennyson." If such there be, Sir Charles must be credited with providing for it a substantial body of new facts. The patient drudgery of biographical reconstruction, no less than the critical evaluation which remain for the future, will owe much to his work.

The merits of *Alfred Tennyson* are many. In its exploration of the poet's youth, its pursuit of the bitter relationship between Somersby and Bayons, its unshinking portrayal of the Laureate's worser sides (the estrangement from Coventry Patmore, the row with Palgrave, the testiness, the eczema, the port wine) it is candid beyond the farthest limits of Victorian convention, without adopting the bad manners of the moderns. The first two-fifths of the book, which cover the period before the recluse of Somersby became the national institution, provide for the first time adequate evidence for Tennyson's distinguishing characteristics of morbid

sensitiveness, loneliness and melancholy. The new material derives from family correspondence, and from Emily, Lady Tennyson's diary and letters, as from recently published new sources. Scholars would be grateful if this new material had been critically described and its incorporation into the text fully documented. It is stated that most of Emily Sellwood's correspondence with Alfred before marriage was burned "at the poet's request," and that most of her letters to the poet after marriage were also destroyed "doubtless at her own desire." But a reference to "his correspondence with Hallam" is unaccompanied by the fact that all Tennyson's letters to Hallam were destroyed by Henry Hallam and that the second Baron, well on in the twentieth century, destroyed Arthur Hallam's letters to Tennyson. This kind of defective documentation renders somewhat difficult the evaluation of certain aspects, biographical and critical, of the book as a whole.

In his modest preface Sir Charles notes that "a chronological story is the easiest for an inexperienced writer to carry through." But while this method produces the "straightforward biography" named in the preface as the author's objective, it fails to pull the facts together into the "full-length portrait," or to supply the "comprehensive study" also aimed at in the preface. For example, there is much new material and sound observation on Tennyson's sensitiveness to criticism, and the "rapid development of his powers of self-criticism;" but, by the chronological plan of the book, the topic is excluded from comprehensive treatment in one place. Similarly, there is important and careful emphasis on the personal or autobiographical element in Tennyson's poetry, an element Tennyson strove always to belittle and to discourage inquirers from investigating. The direct personal experience underlying such figures as Adeline, Lilian, Marion, and such poems as *Maud* and *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After* are illuminatingly revealed, and these are examples chosen at random from many. On the other hand, the discussion of *In Memoriam*, a record of devastating personal emotional experience, tends to echo Bradley and the other Victorians who smothered the glowing reality of the poem beneath their preoccupations with science and religion.

The latter three-fifths of the book err on the side of generosity in piling up the details of the poet's life as national institution, his career as playwright, his brief service in the Lords, and his late pessimism and disillusionment with the times. More than a page is devoted to reminiscences of the coachman at Farringford. But this is all part of the grand compendium, and the whole is both important and valuable.

T. H. VAIL MOTTER

*Historical Division,  
Department of the Army, Washington*

*Pierre.* By HERMAN MELVILLE. Ed. by HENRY A. MURRAY. New York: Hendricks House-Farrar, Straus, 1949. Pp. ciii + 504. \$5.00.

This third volume of the new Complete Works of Herman Melville is a very good one. Henry A. Murray's long introduction and expansive notes make one wish that there were more literary Doctors of Medicine and psychologists around. Not that everyone will find Murray's scholarship impeccable or his critical taste unassailable. The over-scrupulous scholar will perhaps not allow Murray's method of demonstrating influences: "I would wager" that this or that theme in *Pierre* may be traced to Disraeli or Byron. One cannot agree that "the pervading temper of *Pierre* is that of German Romanticism": the temper is, to be sure, partly German; but there is also the temper of Shakespeare, of the Bible (especially the prophetic books and gospels), and even of Hawthorne. And why should we not mention the temper of Melville, an American original? Murray himself tells us that *Pierre* is, among many other mythical figures, "an American Fallen and Crucified Angel." Quite right. But this idea should be followed through. Perhaps the editor regards the question of *Pierre*'s Americanism as a cultural matter, not much in the province of the psychologist. But the attachment of the book to German Romanticism involves a cultural judgment.

I wish to quarrel with Dr. Murray on one more point. But first let me report my respect for his broadly humane learning, his continuous vigor and thoroughness, his less continuous but remarkable wit, his occasional real profundity. The quarrel of which I speak inevitably arises between the psychologist and the student of literature. The psychologist, looking for motives beneath ideas and for the self-symbolization and self-analysis of the author, forgets to look at the work of art. This leads to some confusion in the pages of Dr. Murray, on one of which he tells us that "Melville's insight does not penetrate much further than *Pierre*'s"; and the assumption throughout is that *Pierre* is Melville. Yet on another page Murray says that "everything" in the book "has been completely recast by Melville's shaping will." Surely, "everything" includes *Pierre*.

But in considering a novel like *Pierre*, the psychologist's point of view is enormously valuable. It immediately disposes of the superficial approach which regards the book as "moral philosophy," as, in Murray's words, a system of "logical inductions after an impartial survey of the universe." Melville is not writing a "tragedy of mind" in the usual sense of this phrase, but a tragedy of circumstance, will, and perversion. Lucy cannot be equated with Good or Truth, nor Isabel with Evil or Error. These mythical ladies have to be considered at lower levels of rationality where their sub-

stantial psychic and cultural involvement exists. Dr. Murray's idea that Lucy represents a too innocent and too cheap reconciliation with Society and that Isabel represents a tragic and final alienation allows him to give so far quite the most cogent account of Pierre's troubles.

RICHARD CHASE

*Columbia University*

*Prepositions in French and English*, by CLIFFORD H. BISSELL.

New York: Richard R. Smith, 1947. Pp. xiv + 561.

Professor Bissell's study is most interesting and instructive. Although his purpose is essentially pedagogic, the completeness and abundance of the material is such that they make of the volume a handy reference work which should prove as useful to the scholar as to the student. The comparison of French usage with English, although due to pedagogical reasons, throws a vivid light on the preposition in both languages and will quickly convince the reader how rich in subtle and expressive connotations the preposition is; an inexhaustible source of linguistic phenomena of psychological import because the creation and the semantic evolution of the preposition come directly from the social psyche of the speaking group with a minimum of purely rational or logical direction. In the preposition, the people's linguistic creativeness appears with the fecundity and pliancy of the live growth. This is why the correct and forceful use of the preposition is a privilege of the native speaker whatever his education and learning may be and at the same time so difficult of attainment for foreigners.

Bissell's book does justice to its subject. It is divided into four parts treating respectively of the preposition in special types of syntax, of the use and omission of the preposition with verbal forms, of specific English prepositions and prepositional phrases and finally, of specific French prepositions and prepositional phrases. The subject is thus encompassed and the whole matter well threshed out. A very succinct historical survey introduces it and then, for over five hundred pages, the author handles the preposition with a quickness, an abundance (thousands of examples) and a clarity quite remarkable.

Here are a few specific remarks. P. 47, quoting my thesis (*Origine et histoire de la préposition à dans les locutions du type "faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un,"* Columbia, 1912), he claims, against my opinion, that the difference in the use of the preposition between "je ferai apprendre cette règle à mes élèves" et "je ferai apprendre cette règle par mes élèves" is semasiologically non-existent, in other words, that they mean the same thing. In answer I will say that no linguist will admit the existence of com-

plete synonymity between two words, two constructions etc. As Antoine Meillet has remarked, language is adverse to superfluous expression. Yet these two ways of expressing the agent of the action (ablative and dative) have existed since Indo-European times, evidently because of respective peculiar and interesting connotations. Bissell's commentary on the subject is not convincing and I see no reason to modify the views expressed in my thesis to which I beg to refer the reader.

As this work is primarily a school book, the quotations from authors which comprise most of the expressions cited are not given complete; only the name of the author is mentioned. This suggests the doubt that some may be misquoted as on page 215, where a line of Victor Hugo (On pouvait à des plis qui soulevaient la neige . . .) is attributed to Balzac. However, Bissell's acquaintance with his subject is so thorough that it is unlikely that such mistakes could be anything else than formal. Yet I would like to know who used this expression: "Il faut lever cette appréhension à nos amis" (p. 283); "Je suis de la classe de M. Petit" instead of "Je suis dans la classe de M. Petit" (p. 326); "Le caractère de Henri" and not "Le caractère d'Henri" (p. 341); "prendre le meilleur sur quelqu'un" (p. 364).

I have noticed only one misprint: p. 344, citrons pour citons.

All in all, Bissell's book is a first rate, invaluable book which will prove most useful to teachers and advanced students of French.

H. F. MULLER

*Columbia University*

---

*The Influence of Heinsius and Vossius upon French Dramatic Theory*, by EDITH G. KERN. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1949. *The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*. Extra Vol. xxvi. Pp. 153. \$3.00.

There is much in this book to interest the student of literary criticism. It contains lengthy descriptions of the treatises of Heinsius and Vossius, and attempts to estimate their influence on French dramatic theory. Along the way a number of facts new, to this reader at least, are brought to light. For instance, that all the erudition displayed in d'Aubignac's footnotes to his *Pratique* is derived, indeed copied, from Vossius. Further, the style is more readable and clearer than one usually finds in treatises of this sort.

So, it is disheartening to find so much that is good and worthwhile marred by the fundamental assumptions of the book. For the author, in an attempt to build up her own particular heroes, feels constrained to spend a major part of her effort in undermining the contributions of Julius Caesar Scaliger. Her basic assumption is "Now, whenever ideas are transmitted from one cultural unit to

another in such sporadic manner, those ideas are usually accepted in their latest phase (p. 41)." This completely unproved assertion is the basis for her main argument. By using it she is able to argue that the French critics and dramatists of the 17th century had no real acquaintance with Scaliger or earlier critics, since by this new "law" anything common to Heinsius, Vossius and the older critics must have come from the former two. One cannot accept this on the author's say-so. Even if one could, the fact that both Heinsius and Vossius proudly proclaimed indebtedness to Scaliger would seem to undermine her attack on that critic's contributions. For, an attack it is. When Vossius (to whom Scaliger was a hero) disagrees with Scaliger, the author writes that he "violently opposes Scaliger's attacks." When one reads the original, one can discover only polite disagreement.

It is to be feared that the fundamental misconception of this book can be found in the following two sentences: "Scaliger does not in the least grasp Aristotle's philosophy of art. Whereas Aristotle has a purely esthetic approach, Scaliger strongly stresses the didactic element (p. 38)." She then quotes Butcher to prove that Aristotle is "purely esthetic." Today, very few students of literary criticism would accept Butcher's view of Aristotle. But perhaps this is irrelevant. What is inconceivable for anyone who has any knowledge of French dramatic theory and practice of the 17th century is the calm assumption that the men of that age interpreted Aristotle in this 19th century esthetic manner. Yet, such is Mrs. Kern's, since she goes on to declare, "Aristotelian concepts could not have been derived from Scaliger for the simple reason that he does not follow Aristotle (p. 142)." All that this book proves is that he does not follow Butcher.

That this review seems to be more about Scaliger than Heinsius and Vossius is not the fault of the reviewer. Instead of contenting herself with the very real influence of Heinsius and Vossius, particularly their introduction of the Aristotelian idea of unity of action, she has felt it necessary to claim for them an originality which both of them would have hastened to deny, and in order to do so has attempted to blacken the name of the predecessor whom they both admired above all others.

VERNON HALL, JR.

*Dartmouth College*

---

*Le Printemps: L'Hécatombe à Diane d'AGRIPPA d'AUBIGNÉ.* Edition critique de M. BERNARD GAGNEBIN. Geneva: Droz, 1948. Pp. xxiii + 123.

Since the monumental *Oeuvres complètes d'Agrippa d'Aubigné*, published in 1873-1893 by Réaume and de Caussade, and compiled in accordance with the original documents left by d'Aubigné to his

friend Professor Tronchin, many lacunae have been filled respecting the historical and literary reputation of the warrior-poet. Armand Garnier's *Agrippa d'Aubigné et le parti protestant* of 1928 (in three volumes) reveals a penetrating analysis of the poet's literary stature. More recently, and since 1937, when the archives of the Tronchin family were deposited in the Bibliothèque nationale de Genève, d'Aubigné has come under the closer scrutiny of literary scholars. Monsieur Pierre-Paul Plan in a recent d'Aubigné volume of unpublished documents, (*Pages inédites de Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné*, Genève, 1945), unearths an appreciable number of works, both in prose and in poetry, not incorporated in the earlier *Oeuvres complètes*. The latest work regarding the poet's literary production is the definitive text, corrected by the hand of the author, of the *Hécatombe à Diane*, and published by the conservateur des manuscrits of the Geneva Public Library, M. Bernard Gagnebin.

This collection of one hundred sonnets dedicated to Diane Salviati (de Talcy), the niece of Ronsard's Cassandra, was composed sometime between 1571-1573, but was not published by d'Aubigné until the close of his life. Typically Ronsardian in tone, the first half of the collection sings of the torments and the pains of the lover; then the tone changes into spite and vitriolic indictment, motivated presumably by the fact (related in *Vie à ses enfants*, Réaume, Vol. I, p. 21) that the projected marriage was broken "sur le different de la religion." This definitive edition presented by M. Gagnebin shows a sharp departure from the Réaume version, which has hitherto been accepted as authoritative. The editor bases his work on the ms. 157 of the Tronchin archives, a manuscript which was rearranged and re-edited between 1623 and 1630 by d'Aubigné himself. This redaction, as one studies it carefully, is notable by its classification according to subject matter and makes of the one hundred sonnets a more harmonious whole. Furthermore, this redaction supersedes the ms. 159 which the poet had revised between 1578 and 1583, and which generally had been credited as the definitive work. Thus, Gagnebin's critical edition combines in variants the ms. 159 with the textual version based on the ulterior redaction *in extremis*. The editor notes in this comparative study 27 changes made by the poet, as well as 9 instances in which the errors are common to both mss, the latter being attributed (according to the editor) to possible auditive errors on the part of secretaries.

For the literary scholar, several features of the Gagnebin edition are noteworthy, namely the gradual defection of d'Aubigné's style from pure Ronsardian tradition, as evidenced in the textual emendations from ms. 159 to ms. 157; secondly, a search for a more studied rime effect based upon the *Dictionnaire des rimes* of Odet de la Noue in 1596; thirdly, a style development more and more noticeably refined and *précieux*, with overtones of the Mal-

herbian principles which were to become so dominant in the forty years separating d'Aubigné's two redactions.

Mr. Gagnbin supplements his critical edition with a *Table des incipits*, an index of proper names, a *Glossaire*, the last being subject to some emendations in interpretation, viz: *asserrer* (ix, 5) which he translates as *serrer de près*, should be more properly *assembler, réunir; endurer*, for d'Aubigné means *supporter* and not *souffrir* (lvi, bis); certainly *braver* (Pr. 229) in Renaissance French approximates in meaning the primordial Ronsard concept of *vanter, se faire gloire de*, and not *insulter*.

LEROY J. BENOIT

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Thomas Mann und Goethe.* Von BERNHARD BLUME. Bern: A. Francke, 1949. 155 pp. Sw. Fr. 8. 80.

Mr. Blume's brochure, an expanded and considerably revised version of his articles in *PMLA* (1944), will be of interest to all students of Thomas Mann. His work is divided into nine chapters, each of which treats some important aspect of Mann's relation to Goethe. As such chapter headings as "Nihilismus," "Ironie," and "Dämonie" imply, Mr. Blume seems to have worked, quite rightly, from Mann back to Goethe, rather than following the alternative procedure.

The author makes no claim of having exhausted this rich and very complicated subject; that would require a book of far larger scope. He does provide much interesting material and many critical insights. He stresses, for example, that Goethe's real significance for Mann began quite late in the novelist's career; Goethe's influence on the earlier works is rather slight, compared to that of Schopenhauer, Wagner, or Nietzsche. In the *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, as Blume acutely notes, even Lagarde plays a more decisive role than does Goethe. In recent statements, Mann seems to have projected his present devotion to the poet back into his youth.

Blume's first chapter, "Spiegelung," is an admirable introduction to his theme, and his discussion of *Lotte in Weimar* is especially good. His analysis of Mann's antithetical, not to say ambivalent style, as it appears in such combinations as "verantwortungsvolle Ungebundenheit" or "diskrete Kühnheit," is highly enlightening; he well relates them to Goethe's idea of polarity. He emphasizes that Goethe's primary significance to Mann is that of a human, rather than a literary exemplar: the Goethean life is the great instance of the victorious synthesis of *Geist* and nature. One is rather surprised that Blume gives so little attention to the relation, pointed out by Mann himself, between Goethe and Joseph, who achieves a similar synthesis.

Blume's book is a thoughtful and useful study. Probably it is too early to expect anything like a last word on the subject, but one does miss some sort of critical summation. Has Mann added significant valid elements to our concept of the poet? To what extent has he stylized Goethe? Has he even created, at times, a *Goethebild* in his own image? The book contains occasional remarks which would be helpful in answering these difficult questions, but no conclusive statement. It ends with the chapter "Dämonie," centered on *Dr. Faustus*, which is very good in itself; but since the relation between *Faust* and *Dr. Faustus* is almost entirely one of contrast, this section does not particularly illuminate the general relationship of Mann to Goethe. Thus one feels the lack of a concluding statement all the more.

While the double typographical error "Irvin Babbit" is annoying, *Thomas Mann und Goethe* is, on the whole, carefully and attractively printed.

HENRY C. HATFIELD

*Columbia University*

---

*Schiller.* By WILLIAM WITTE. Modern Language Studies VI. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. xvii + 211 pp. 12s. 6d.

It seems very appropriate that during a year when every effort is being made to celebrate the 200th anniversary of Goethe's birth some attention should be paid to his great friend Schiller whose status as one of the major figures in modern European literature is liable to be ignored. The fact for instance that none of Schiller's works is represented in such a series of world literature in translation as the Modern Library nor, to my knowledge, available any longer in any good translation is difficult to comprehend at a time when Schiller's ideas could contribute so much as a means of orientation in our troubled world.

The author of the present study is convinced that Schiller has a vital message for our age and that what he had to give "belongs not to Germany alone but to mankind at large, and the Western civilization in particular as part and parcel of its enduring heritage." He shares Schiller's conviction that "art, being an approach to some absolute and ultimate good, can help to save the "Soul-politic" by its effect on individual souls." That conviction animated large sections of the book, and proved of considerable value in transforming dates and events into a very readable account of Schiller's life and work. The procedure is most evident in the first chapter in which the autobiographical data of Schiller's personal and artistic struggles appear as interdependent and mutually reinforcing. Such a presentation has the advantage of illustrating Schiller's belief

in the ennobling effects of art from his own life so that his esthetic theory is integrated with the experience of his life and therefore becomes much less abstract and much more than a mere outgrowth of eighteenth century enlightenment philosophy. It is only consistent when the author, in his subsequent discussion of Schiller's esthetic views does not accept the narrow interpretation of pure esthetics and finds more justification for Schiller's fusion of esthetic and ethical ideals than the latter might be inclined to permit.

About one-half of the book is devoted to the discussion of Schiller's plays. In this section, the author follows the traditional way of giving a fairly detailed account of sources and plans, followed by summaries and esthetic analyses of the plays. Such a procedure is not without its merits, especially since for many years there have appeared but very few comprehensive studies of Schiller in the English language. To this reviewer a literary and aesthetic analysis of Schiller's plays without sufficient reference to the development of the poet's philosophy inherent in these plays seems somewhat one-sided. In particular it fails to reveal enough of Schiller's lasting significance, which, after all, was one of the major purposes of the book. Yet this reviewer also admits that his own tendency goes too far in the other direction, by overemphasizing the philosophical aspects of Schiller's work and paying too little attention to the artistic embodiment of philosophical problems in works of art. The more reason for him heartily to welcome the present Schiller study as a valuable addition to the literature on Schiller written in the English language.

F. W. KAUFMANN

Oberlin College

---

*Notker der Dichter und seine geistige Welt.* Von WOLFRAM VON DEN STEINEN. Bern, 1948. 1. Editionsband, pp. 227 + 4 Tafeln. 2. Darstellungsband, pp. 640. 44 Swiss francs.

This *editio princeps* of the Sequences and Hymns of the St. Gall monk Notker Balbulus (840-912) is indeed a monumental work. The first volume contains 1) the Latin text with a German translation of the Sequences, arranged into the groups: Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Sanctorale, and Commune Sanctorum; 2) the other poems of the author without translation; 3) Sequences by other authors in use at St. Gall in the earliest period. The text is followed by a Critical Apparatus, in which all the variant manuscript readings are recorded. The only prior edition of the *Liber Hymnorum* was that by B. Pez in his *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus* 1 (1721) from a single manuscript from the St. Emmeram monastery in Regensburg, and reprinted by Migne, *Patrologia latina*, vol. 131. This manuscript was not a happy choice for the text and has value only for the Prooemium.

The second volume begins with an historical sketch, describing the background of the age of Notker, the monastery of St. Gall and an account of Notker's life. The second part discusses the origin of psalmodic poetry, its artistic and metrical form, mediaeval music and the emergence of the Sequence. The third part deals primarily with the interpretation of the Prooemium, the method of authentication of Notker's works, chiefly from inner stylistic characteristics. Parts four to seven contain an exhaustive commentary on each of the hymns in volume I, wherein non-Notker works treating the same topic are compared with Notker's. These parts or books, as the author calls them, exhibit a sound, often poetic, interpretative talent, which helps one in many hymns really to feel that deep, controlled emotion of the original, as well as that of its interpreter. Book eight deals with the so-called Notker-school, i. e. those later Sequence-writers who were influenced by the master, particularly Ekkehart I. The ninth book is concerned with such matters as Notker's poetries, the complete listing of his works with comments on the manuscripts and an exhaustive bibliography, works attributed to Notker, comments on the works of scholars who have written on the subject, friends and teachers of the author. The tenth book contains the scholia to the individual sequences.

This brief table of contents of the two volumes is merely to give an idea of the wealth of information and learning within them. The subject-matter is treated fully in every respect, cross-references are given at all points in the text and commentary, in addition to the index. The work not only embodies all we know of Notker Balbulus and his writings, but its thoroughness and its method of presentation is an enormous advance in the treatment of mediaeval texts.

EDWARD H. SEHRT

*George Washington University*

---

#### BRIEF MENTION

---

*Die Finsternisse. Requiem.* By GERHART HAUPTMANN. With an Essay by WALTER A. REICHART. (Aurora, N. Y.: Hammer Press) 1947. 28 pp. Diese Erstausgabe einer dramatischen Scene Gerhart Hauptmanns in einer beschränkten Auflage von 400 Exemplaren würde ein buchhändlerisches Ereignis sein, wenn wir nicht allmählig daran gewöhnt worden wären, daß Werke deutscher Dichter im Auslande erschienen; aber es ist in diesem Falle dennoch eine besondere Angelegenheit, denn Hauptmann lebte noch, als der Herausgeber, Professor Walter A. Reichart, von ihm die Erlaubnis der Veröffentlichung erhielt für ein Werk, das sicher erst aus dem Nachlasse und vielleicht spät bekannt geworden wäre. Es handelt

sich hier um ein Requiem für einen langjährigen Freund Hauptmanns, der 1934 verstarb und als Jude trotz seiner Verdienste um das schlesische Neustadt, in der er, Fabrikant und Wohltäter großen Stils, ohne Teilnahme der Stadt, ohne vorherige Anzeige, in aller Stille mußte begraben werden. Außer der Familie nahmen nur die Hauptmanns an der Beerdigung teil, aber an der Tafel saßen beim Totenmahl—so sehen wir es in diesem Requiem—der Prophet Elias, der Jünger Johannes und der Ewige Jude Ahasver, und aus dem Munde eines der Teilnehmer schreit der Prophet Habakuk: "Herr, wie lange soll ich schreien, und Du willst nicht hören? Wie lange soll ich Dir rufen über Frevel, und Du willst nicht helfen." Geschrieben im dritten Jahre nach dem Tode von Max Pinkus, der als Mitherausgeber der Hauptmannbibliographie und Besitzer wohl der größten Hauptmannsammlung und einer umfangreichen Bibliothek von Silesiana bekannt war, wurde das Manuskript oder vielmehr eine Abschrift davon unter allerlei Abenteuern aus dem Lande geschmuggelt. Es war ein Akt der Pietät, daß es geschrieben, ein Akt der Pietät, daß es durch Dr. Reichart veröffentlicht wurde; und ihm gebührt für dessen Herausgabe in dieser würdigen Ausstattung sowie für den schönen und gehaltenen Nachruf auf den Verstorbenen und ihm vertrauten Freund Max Pinkus unser Dank.

E. F.

---

*Conrad Celtis.* Selections, edited with translation and commentary by LEONARD FORSTER. New York: Macmillan Company, 1948. Pp. xii + 123. Since it is fashionable among German literary historians to deny the existence of 15th century Renaissance in the world of German letters, I should like to advise all concerned to read not only Celtis' *poems* and the *oratio* in Forster's transparent translation but also his most lucid commentaries. This should convince the unbiased reader that ancient Latin topics came to life once more in the verses of Celtis, and should induce the obstinate sceptic to reconsider the problem, the intricacy of which is caused by the preference for Latin on the part of German writers. Celtis is a German poet who happens to write in Latin. To do otherwise, would have disqualified him in the eyes of the humanists. Unfortunately, posterity refused him his right place in the German literature for just that reason. His challenge *Convertite vos, Germani, convertite vos at mitiora studia* should be followed not only by the *Germani* but by the germanists who do not seem to realize that the poet of 1500 is above all required to be a scholar. Celtis, mercurial, vain, and unlovable though he appeared, was none the less closer to Goethe than anyone of his contemporaries, including the shoemaker of Nürnberg. His love poems, such as *De nocte et osculo Hasilinae* (p. 26 f.), can stand comparison with the *Römische Elegien* of the great Weimar student of classical form.

The difference is but the language. Latin is the vehicle of this renascent culture; it supplies what the German lacks, what—according to Forster—German was not to achieve for another hundred years, when the work of Celtis and others like him had been assimilated. The student of the German literature of the 15th century cannot gain a true picture from reading German alone, since only a few, and not the best writers, chose German, the mere use of which stamped them out of the Parnassian world. All this is magnificently verified by Forster's valuable book which may encourage translations of Eobanus Hessus, Petrus Secundus, Frischlin, Hutten, and even luminaries such as Dedekind or Naogeorg.

A. S.

*Le Lai de l'Ombre.* By JEHAN RENART. Edited by JOHN ORR. Edinburgh University Publications. Language and Literature (Texts) No. 1. Edinburgh: The University Press, 1948. Pp. xxiv + 90. 8/6. It is a pleasure to welcome the first volume in this new Edinburgh University Publications. Professor Orr gives us an edition of Jehan Renart's *Lai de l'Ombre* from manuscript E—rejected by Bédier in favor of A in his famous *SATF* edition of 1913, but reproduced by him in 1929—that is designed for students and admirably suited to its purpose. It contains a readable introduction summarizing the story of the *Lai* and analyzing the style and other works of its author; it also describes all the manuscripts of the poem and successfully justifies the editor's choice. The edition lacks any section on language and versification, but contains a critical bibliography, a good glossary and copious notes which deal with variants and difficult passages. The editor corrects some thirty-seven readings of his basic manuscript, a few of which might have been retained (e. g. *fous* for *fel* in line 14; the omission of line 48a, etc.), but the critical apparatus supplies enough material so that the reader may readily make his own decisions. The whole volume will be useful to scholars as well as beginners since it includes the results of recent investigations, among them Rita Lejeune-Dehoussé's important studies which were of course not yet written when Bédier made his editions. Both editor and press are to be thanked for presenting one of the most delightful works of the thirteenth century in a suitably attractive manner.<sup>1</sup>

G. F.

<sup>1</sup> Competent and exhaustive reviews of Orr's edition by Percival B. Fay will be found in *Romance Philology*, II, 1949, 338-345; by Raphael Levy in *MP*, XLVII (1949), 65-66.

*To Help Your Students  
Say It In Spanish-Quickly*

# FUNK & WAGNALLS ENGLISH-SPANISH CONVERSATIONAL DICTIONARY

By JOHN E. AGUIAR,  
*University of San Francisco*

**M**ORE than a dictionary, this important little reference will be a boon to students and to those planning trips to Spanish speaking countries.

In two sections, Part One lists alphabetically by verbs, and translates, thousands of English sentences, phrases and idiomatic expressions. For instance, if you wanted to ask "Where is such and such a place," you would simply look up the verb "is." You would either find it immediately or know for sure it isn't in the book.

Part Two translates 17,000 English words, showing different meanings and their precise Spanish equivalents. For example the word "get" is listed as: get (arrive); get (attain); get (go for); get (understand) and so forth.

Furthermore, a clear explanation of the pronunciation of Spanish letters supplemented by a phonetic rendition of letters and syllables very different from English, is included. Helpful grammatical notes and several important tenses, plus irregular verb forms, will aid students in composing their own sentences.

John E. Aguiar teaches Spanish at the University of San Francisco. The idea for writing this book grew out of his classroom work where he clearly saw the need for the help this book affords. It's a book your students will welcome, and use over and over again.

\$3.00

*Send for a copy on approval.*

**FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY**

153 East 24th Street New York 10, N.Y.

# LANSON AND TUFFRAU



"Among the  
most  
excellent  
manuals  
we possess  
of any  
literature"

## MANUEL D'HISTOIRE *de la* LITTÉRATURE FRANÇAISE

A comprehensive evaluation of the significant writers and their works, from the *Chansons de Geste* to the works of Proust, Gide, and Valéry. For the serious student of French literature at any level. Illustrated. 772 pages.

\$7.00

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA  
SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

has the honor to announce the appointment

of

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ,

*Professor of French, Columbia University*

as Consulting Editor for the French Series of the

MODERN STUDENT'S LIBRARY